

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the REV. S. C. CARPENTER, D.D., MASTER OF THE TEMPLE, c/o S.P.C.K.
HOUSE, NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, LONDON, W.C. 2, to whom MSS.
should be sent.

Vol. XXIX

SEPTEMBER, 1934

No. 171

EDITORIAL

A RECENT event has given a fresh turn to the progress of the Reunion cause. It has occurred in what we hope it is not uncharitable to call an unexpected quarter. Italy is within that "zone of the olive-tree" which Professor Deissmann found so significant ("the world of the olive-tree the world of St. Paul!"), but the Imperial City has not, as a rule, distributed the branches very freely. A small one has just come to hand. It is a shoot of the genuine tree, but it is only out of a private garden, and there is a disposition in the official organs of the Southern European Horticultural Society, with branches everywhere, to minimize its importance. All things considered, it is perhaps not very surprising that the eirenicon of "Father Jerome," who now proves to be the Rev. Albert Gille, S.J., has not had a good press in Roman Catholic circles. A friend of the author, a member of his own Order, is quoted in the Prefatory Note as having acutely summed up the hopes and the embarrassments which it was likely to create in the words "Thank heaven for the book, but God help the writer!" On the other hand, it only says in a considered and genuinely constructive way what has been hinted at in many a private conversation, and its dedication to the memory of Cardinal Mercier and Viscount Halifax shews that the spirit of Malines is not dead. The mention of Malines is very relevant. It appears that Father Gille has lived mainly on the Continent and in India, a fact which helps to explain him. His book runs directly counter to the stiff official policy which ever since Manning has been dominant at Westminster, but it contains conclusions to which a discerning, liberal-minded continental or missionary priest might well be led. But the author has further evidence from nearer home. He speaks of "many English priests, both secular and religious," who "hold that Cardinal Mercier's move was the only sane, sensible, and hopeful effort towards regaining the Anglican Church; only these priests are not allowed to express their opinion in print. The censors see to that."

The merits of the book are its charity, its realism, and its sound psychology. The author's stiffer friends will complain that he is weak in doctrine, and that he has sold the pass. But he is a traitor only if there are no such things as scales of values, only if it must be supposed that everything is equally necessary. And can that really be believed? We all have our principles (some less than others, and others less than that) and our ways of arriving at conclusions about truth. There are things for which, and things against which, we should, with the help of God, elect to die, if the occasion came. But Father Gille understands that the sort of experience which has made English Churchmen what they are is the Prayer Book and the Parish Church. He has developed an interesting form of what is everywhere the new technique in Reunion politics. In the very spirit of Lambeth or Lausanne he says: "It is not enough to take away from Anglicans what they can afford to lose; it is also necessary to let them have what they can afford to keep—if it is at all possible." What the Anglican wants to keep is "his church, his ceremonial, his Authorized Version, his hymns, and his friends, the whole contingent setting of his religious life, which education and long association have endeared to him more than anything else." It is very largely an affair of "atmosphere, rite, liturgy." Thus, even though we have not yet come to the specific policy which he puts forward, it is plain that his "atmosphere" is not that which the official system has hitherto released. The publication in 1920 of Father Leslie Walker's *The Problem of Reunion* was significant. Its tone was friendly, but its argument, when analyzed, was nothing more than "Come over to us, and you will find that we shall treat you very well." In fact the policy of absorption, laid aside everywhere else, is still retained by the official representatives of the Roman Catholic Church and by a few small eccentric Protestant sects, and by no one else at all. Father Gille for his part has abandoned it. He says: "Both have to sacrifice something; Anglicans their excessive personality, Catholics their excessive impersonality. Take our bones and give us your muscles, and we build up a complete body."

No doubt Father Gille has become somewhat "detribalized." And, while a certain measure of this process is essential for a would-be mediator, an excess of it is a disqualification. One of his critics says that his book "betrayed a disgruntled outlook, the result of some purely personal grievance." Of this we have no knowledge, but he certainly believes that in the Roman Church there is too much discipline, that an unreasoning piety has introduced and an unreasonable piety has stereotyped

a multitude of small devotions, and has put, as St. Peter once said, "a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear," that custom has led to pedantry, especially in Moral Theology, that there is in France and of late even in England an extravagant Papadulia, beyond what is required for an intelligent understanding of "Infallibility." All this, congenial as it may be to ourselves, must be very hard for a conventional Papalist to bear, and it is evident that more water must flow under the bridge before his suggestions become popular at Rome. Briefly, they are as follows: that the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion should be united into one society, which should thenceforth exist in two departments. The two rites are to continue side by side, and the two priesthoods, and the two sets of customs. Infallibility is not to be pressed, just as the *Filioque* clause is not brandished defiantly in the face of the Easterns. The Anglicans are to be allowed to go on believing about Infallibility as St. Thomas Aquinas believed, and, if Transubstantiation prove difficult, "to go back to the more unsophisticated formula of St. Irenaeus." Anglican Orders would have to be "rectified," but he suggests that there is no difficulty there, inasmuch as the Bishops at Lambeth have declared that "our clergy would willingly accept a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry . . . as having its place in the one family life." On the other hand, he is sure that the Roman Catholics would gain a great deal from what we have to give.

We turn from this unauthorized indiscretion to the heavier metal of an article in the July number of *Blackfriars* by Father Henry St. John, O.P. There is in it much friendliness, but the policy is that of incorporation. Father St. John knows much more about the Church of England than many of his colleagues. He does not think it is the devil's way of keeping Englishmen out of the Catholic Church. He is not deceived by what he calls "the extreme pro-Roman handful." He appreciates the element in the ethos of the Church which he finds to be represented by *Essays Catholic and Critical*, THEOLOGY, the Cathedrals of York, Winchester, Chichester, and Chester, and the recent Charge of the Bishop of Bradford, as well as the effect which all this, and much more to which he does not refer, has had on the main body of the Church. His conclusion is that the Holy Spirit is working in and through the Church of England, which seems to him to be learning the Notes of the Church in the reverse order. "It has appreciated Apostolicity from the beginning, has made progress towards a knowledge of

Catholicity, and it has realized something of the meaning of Holiness; but it has no understanding whatever of the Catholic conception of Unity." What Father St. John hopes to see is "a catholicized Church of England approaching the Holy See with a request for union." He does not profess to know "on what terms an organized, autonomous body, with branches in every part of the English-speaking world, with its own traditions and customs, its own vernacular Liturgy, and married clergy, might be received into the unity of the Church," but he is sure that, "for the sake of such an accession of souls, *the Church of God* (italics ours) would be prepared to make wide concessions in all things not of the essence of the Faith." The most hopeful thing in his article is that, after faintly praising the Malines Conversations as "inopportune" (though he is really thinking in terms of geography rather than of date), he goes on to recommend conferences organized here in England with the sanction of the Hierarchy. "Such a policy, undertaken in the right spirit, would shift the emphasis in the expression 'separated brethren' from the first to the second word." This is followed by an unyielding sentence about "the Catholic position that those who see, by the gift of Faith, that communion with the See of Peter is the ultimate test of Catholicity are bound in conscience to make their submission to the Church or risk the loss of their salvation."

The article just misses that which was so attractive in the book, the recognition of the possibility of an alliance, of what Pusey (till 1870) called Healthful Reunion. It is not wonderful. It is not that Father St. John is one whit less charitable than Father Gille. But he is the Counsel for the defence. Nay, more, he is, as it were, one of the Crown Lawyers. And Crown Lawyers in the preliminary skirmishes are mortally afraid of what they call "prejudice." In other words, they never give anything away. But even the Crown Lawyers, when they go before a Judge, cannot command the verdict they would like. A conference such as he suggests, towards which we gladly promise any help which this Journal can rightly give, would reveal the necessity of recognizing some such possibility, if anything is to be *done*. We do not for our part wish to make the mistake, which the Presbyterians made lately, of using the word "equality" before we begin. It is unwise to formulate verdicts at that stage. The aim would be rather to explore the meaning of "fraternity" in an atmosphere of "liberty," at the end of which process it would be found that "equality" had never even been mentioned. This insistence on the note of alliance is not, we are convinced, mere face-saving. The

thing is too important for *προσωποληψία*. It would be in the interests of fact-saving, or, more accurately, in the interests of the conservation of values. Meantime, though he does not concede this, or, conceivably, does not feel authorized publicly to concede it, Father St. John's article is itself a step forward. We admire his courage and his charity. He comes near to re-enacting (what more could he desire?) the part of Blessed Peter at the Council of Jerusalem. At that Council it appears that Barnabas and Paul produced no arguments. They were content to refer to facts. There are some facts which a complete judgment will have to take into consideration. But who is there to play the part of James? For that we must look to "that impersonal force, the voice of which is becoming clearer and more certain every day, the verdict of really impartial History. The figure of History sits enthroned in the clouds; the weapons of our partisanship cannot touch her, and our efforts to escape from her are vain." In these solemn words, which almost reach the majesty of Richard Hooker, Dr. Sanday spoke of the gradual reading by humanity of the Mind of God.

All this is good, and full of promise. But there is one large and stubborn fact which has not yet been mentioned, the fact that there are many members of the Church of England who have very few of the convictions which Father Gille or Father St. John regard with sympathy, who would decline outright to have any dealings with Rome. Even apart from the mass of sheer Protestantism, which is entirely unmoved by these approaches or, if moved, is moved in the wrong direction, there is the point of view revealed by Professor Bethune-Baker in *Unity and Truth* (Cambridge, 1s.). It is the work of a truth-loving scholar, who chooses his words with care and is scrupulous to avoid any over-statement. There breathes through it an exquisitely Christian temper. The theological terminology is so rarefied that we wonder how long it would continue to command the old credit at the bank of truth. But with that we are not now concerned, except in so far as it makes the Professor feel that the ecclesiastical mind is essentially one "that must be converted." "The kind of reunion that seems to be in view is based on a false conception of unity." "The call of Christ comes to us today—*μετανοεῖτε* all ye Christian ecclesiastics, clerical and lay alike. Get a new point of view. Must ye for ever be tithing mint and anise and cummin?" He knows that in point of fact "creeds and institutions we must have," and he seems erroneously to suppose that all ecclesiastics are committed to the one-fold rather than the one-flock theory, but he is in himself the ultra-Modernist, non-ecclesiastical,

almost anti-ecclesiastical, scholar. Even if there are not very many who are actually with him, the sword that he bears is one of fine steel, and he wields it, not to fight, but to prick insincerities and what seem to him superstitions. Approaches from Roman Catholics such as those welcomed above leave him quite indifferent. Not thus, he believes, shall we win our way to "the truth as it is in Jesus." What then shall we do to bring together the *via Appia* and the Lady Margaret Professor? There is only one way, to lay hold on eternal life, wherever it is found. The ecclesiastics must remember that theirs is a dangerous trade. They must not try to make, but keep, their creed and institution spiritual and evangelical. And the lonely scholar, with his passion for the truth as it is in Jesus, must remember that he also is of the body, even as these ecclesiastics. "If the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; it is not therefore not of the body." Seen from the point of view of Roman Catholic or Methodist, we are a tough morsel. He who would suffer us must not have the high look or the proud stomach. Seen by the angels and archangels, seen in ourselves as we really are, we are a many-coloured entity. It is at any given time, as we turn in any particular direction, our infirmity. It is ultimately our hope. For the final truth is a thing greater than anyone yet knows. Whether in innocence or by design, the well-known Ascription of Praise does bring together religion simple and religion scholarly, religion philosophical and religion institutional, and find in all of them a contribution to religion saintly and the fullness of Christ's Body.

Thy word hath sounded forth,
Not only in Jerusalem and Antioch,
In Athens and in Rome:
But in every place the faith of Christ
Is spread abroad:

All glory be to Thee, O Lord.

The article by Dr. Mozley in this number was read originally at the July Conference of the Anglican Fellowship at Oxford. We are hoping next month to print another paper from the same source, an essay by Canon A. L. Lilley on the place of the Resurrection in mediæval theology. The Anglican Fellowship, which exists mainly for the purpose of holding an annual conference, but also has study groups in various localities, is a small but interesting body, to which new members are from time to time admitted on nomination. Their subject next year is to be "The Holy Communion in the Thought and Life of the Church."

THE RISEN CHRIST AND THE HISTORICAL ORDER

The action of Christ who is risen on mankind whom he redeemed fails not, but increases.—LORD ACTON.

THAT is a very simple and a very tremendous sentence. It comes, as some of you know, from the inaugural lecture which Lord Acton delivered in 1895 when he succeeded Sir John Seeley as Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge. Lord Acton was a man of quite exceptional learning, full worthy to stand beside any German Gelehrte. Men of that range and depth of scholarship are not very common in England—or, I dare say, anywhere. And while many a man may have wished to say or even have said something like to the sentence from which we start, few indeed have had a right to say it because their intimacy with history entitled them to form and pass such a judgment. Nor could it come from one who merely possessed vast knowledge of the course of history. To be an encyclopædia is doubtless not the same thing as to be a historian; it is certainly not identical with being a philosopher and a theologian, and a real right to be acclaimed by those titles must belong to one who interprets the course of history as a record which bears witness to Christ, to His Cross and Passion and glorious Resurrection. Acton may not have been a metaphysician in the sense in which the term would apply to one who held a professorial chair, and he may not have been a theologian according to whatever are the true standards for determining the existence in any particular case of that rather elusive person. But read, or even look at the notes to that inaugural lecture, and consider whether he must not have been a very near relation of each of those professors of a great science.

It is nearly forty years since Acton delivered his judgment. It was based particularly on the fact of ethical progress and of the growth of liberty which he saw revealed in history. To this fact nineteenth-century Liberalism gave its enthusiastic adherence. The difference between Acton and many eminent Liberals of his time was that, whereas they were often quite unprepared to connect the fact of political and social progress with Christianity and the Person of Christ, except for the inspiration of His moral teaching, Acton accounted for the fact by an explanation which presupposes the truth of the fundamental theology of the Christian Church. Thus we reach the curious result that just where Acton and other Liberals were most confident, most sure of the character of the supreme lesson which history had to teach, Acton must have appeared to not

a few of them as supplying an incredible interpretation of the presence of that lesson within the historical order. To spell out the meaning of human progress by an appeal to a highly dogmatic creed must have seemed to them perversely wrong-headed, an unequal yoking of the forward-looking and the reactionary mind. The same surprise must have been felt by numbers of those who were the most faithful followers of Gladstone in his application of what he and they would have regarded as Liberal principles to political issues. To them his theology and Churchmanship were as a closed book which could not have the smallest relevance to those great matters of justice, liberty, and progress for which, as they recognized, he cared as passionately as they did.

But what would Acton have said had he been lecturing today? The whole nineteenth-century stress upon ordered historical progress in the direction of freedom is in part rejected and in part maintaining itself with great difficulty. Over a large area of Europe, liberty as it was understood and valued in the last century has disappeared. The intensest, the most virile, and the most successful political movements of the day—Bolshevism, Fascism, Nazism—have apparently no regard for liberty as an ideal, and much less do they make room for it as a fact. And while there is much to be said for the view that these movements have no deep roots to secure their continuance, and that in shorter rather than longer time they will cease to illuminate or obscure the political landscape, it is impossible to forecast with any assurance the next turn in the social and political life of man. Confusion and indifference are the marks of our age. The clean differences of opinion within a solid fabric of agreed convictions which were typical of the epoch in which many of us grew up have passed away. It is ironical to recall another great sentence of Acton's in the same lecture: "This constancy of progress," he writes, "of progress in the direction of organized and assured freedom, is the characteristic fact of modern history and its tribute to the theory of providence." It is evident that whatever tribute may represent the payment of that post-modern history into which we have entered, it will be something quite different from that in which Acton saw both the action of heaven upon earth and the response of earth to heaven.

We shall need to return to a consideration of this question from the angle of vision which has been forced upon us. It was not Acton's, and could not be. He had seen history on the march taking possession of a promised land in which the noblest of hopes and possibilities had reached the stage of achievement. Would that we could know what he would have

said had he lived to gaze upon the march back, the retrogression, the abandonment of country in which he believed with his whole soul that mankind had found the home in which God intended it to dwell. But now let us look more carefully at his words. What is the meaning of the increasing action of the risen Christ upon history? And why the reference to the resurrection? We shall gain help from the writings of other Christians who have a special right to be heard in this connexion, two of them being among the greatest of the Christian teachers of the nineteenth century.

First, Brooke Foss Westcott: no theologian of his time surpassed him or perhaps equalled him in insight into the far-reaching consequences of the Lord's resurrection, and his two books, *The Gospel of the Resurrection* and *The Revelation of the Risen Lord*, remain in the first order of contributions to their subject. In the former of them there is a chapter entitled "The Resurrection and History." For Westcott the resurrection stands at the centre of human history; "to this point," he writes, "all former history converges as to a certain goal; from this point all subsequent history flows as from its life-giving spring" (p. 88). Further, he claims to have shewn from his survey of the *Preparatio evangelica*, of the Apostolic Age, and of what he calls "the triple division of post-Christian history" (p. 82), that the resurrection is "at once the end and the beginning of vast developments of life and thought . . . that it has formed the starting-point of all progressive modern societies, ever presenting itself in new lights according to the immediate wants of the age" (p. 113).

Next among the witnesses comes the scholar's scholar, the profoundest thinker of the Cambridge three, that judge of his own work so severe, so exacting, that in his case other human judgment could hardly be anything but superfluous—Fenton John Anthony Hort. There are few greater if few more difficult books of the highest and purest type of philosophical theology than his Hulsean Lectures, *The Way, the Truth, the Life*. The book is a study of the universal and inexhaustible significance of Christ. In His light Hort did indeed see life steadily and see it whole. No one was ever less conventionally ecclesiastical than this great scholar; but no one has been more conscious of the unique responsibility of the Church with regard to the entire span of man's thought and action. In the notes and illustrations to the Lectures comes this sentence: "The history of the Church, if it could ever be truly written, would be the most composite of all histories, since it would have to set forth the progress of every element of humanity since its invisible Head was revealed." What that would involve is, I

will not say made clear, but adumbrated in those few pages so solemn, so eloquent according to the noblest meaning of the word, so suggestive of a gift of sight to which few, indeed, attain, with which the lectures on *The Life* ends. The life of Christ, so runs the judgment (for one can hardly speak of argument here) is determinative of the quality of all life that deserves the name. It is only as the Supreme Life that His life can be truly known. "He destroyed nothing that had life: He lives that all which once lived may live again in Him." Whatever turns against Him and will have none of Him may gain its little hour of destructive triumph, but of enduring life it can have no hope, since that life is to be found only in submission to Him. Our modern sky, full as it is of clouds blacker and more ominous than those of sixty years ago—though Hort would have looked upon them undismayed—is illuminated by this conviction of his that history bears its twofold witness, negative as well as positive, to Christ. We will try to look once again at this our sky through Hort's eyes, when we have noted how the signs of the times are read by some of those who have abandoned the Christian tradition and the interpretation of life through Christ.

My third testimony comes from one who could not be named with Westcott or Hort as a theologian, but stood in the front rank of historical students for learning and insight, one trained in the school of Acton, and combining a fervent attachment to the ideals of political freedom with a yet stronger devotion to the Christianity of the New Testament and the Church. And John Neville Figgis possessed a power of intelligible dramatic statement which put his learning more easily within the grasp of the ordinary reader. His American lecture entitled *Civilization at the Cross Roads* is a pre-war study of the contemporary world and of the various contending philosophies that were striving both to interpret it and to master it, with, as its background, the author's special knowledge of the makings of European society. What impressed him most seems to have been the contrast between the order which, with all its failings, the Christian Church had brought into life and thought and the chaos both of life and thought which had followed upon the widespread reaction against the Christian world-view. And on this he pronounces a judgment which was to be ratified sooner than is always the case with a prophet's forebodings. "This," he writes, "cannot continue. A civilization to endure will have to mean something, and 'projected efficiency' will not satisfy any race which considers its latter end. Against the dissolution which is otherwise in store for us, there is nothing to stand but the life of the Christian Church" (p. 63). Writing more as an

apologist and in a more consciously controversial spirit than Hort, he is at one with him in his appeal to the intimate relation of the Church to the whole of life, so that it is as "sharing in the central stream of the Life that the Catholic would justify himself" (p. 213); while as to that crucial test which concerns the power to create moral personality he asks the question: "Speaking on the whole, can anyone seriously maintain that any other religion is likely to take the place of the Christian, or that any other society can approach the Christian Church in the production of the highest characters?"

"The influence of the *risen* Christ . . . increases." There can be no doubt where the special challenge of that sentence lies, nor where for the Christian its inspiration. The question could be discussed in a very different way if it were merely concerned with the extent to which the teaching and example of a great character in past history were still affecting the minds and moving the wills of living men. But that is precisely what Acton did not mean. He was speaking of one who was for him in the fullest sense the Living One. No words could suggest more clearly the importance of the idea of resurrection as compared with that of survival. For the idea of resurrection carries with it the idea of power. The New Testament bears unfailing and decisive witness to this association. The Christ who could not be holden by death is the Christ who must reign. No different is the witness of the historic Church. The crucifix may have come to be for many centuries its best known emblem, and still be so in some countries: its most sacred rite may have centred in the memorial of a painful death, but the Christ whom the Church worshipped was the risen and reigning Christ. The imperialistic claims of the mediæval Church, through the Papacy, may seem to us as out of character with Christian discipleship as its nature is suggested by the Gospel records, and the fate of those claims to register a splendid but inevitable failure; but the background of that epoch of Church history was the belief that, through His Church and pre-eminently through His Vicar, Christ was ruling in the earthly order. Long centuries before Augustine had taught that the millennium was no future event, but that it represented the rule of Christ with His saints. Here is something utterly removed from the cult of the greatest of teachers: what the Church confessed, what it sought to express, was the authority, the *dominion* of an invisible King.

And just at this point the break with historic Christianity is sharpest, and is brought to its clearest statement or most obvious implication by some of our modern men of intellectual standing and wide reputation.

Whatever they may believe about Christ, they do not believe

that He is risen and that it is as risen that He influences mankind. They may specifically reject the resurrection or they may ignore it: the result is the same. Thus some twenty years ago, H. G. Wells, near the beginning of his passing from the rank of popular story writer to that of national publicist, prophet, and political guide, in the book *First and Last Things*, referred disapprovingly to the narrative of the Resurrection in the Gospels as akin to the happy endings that brought novels and plays to a conventional conclusion. Whether it may have been at the same time a true ending, an ending that really happened, he did not discuss. Mr. Wells has not, I think, ever shewn himself greatly interested in Christ. That curious phase in his thinking and writing which saw the publication of *Mr. Britling sees it Through* and *God the Invisible King* was not marked by any turning towards Christ as at least one of the chiefest of the revealers of God. In this respect Mr. Wells is notably different from Mr. Shaw, whose thought has constantly turned Christwards. But as Mr. Shaw more obviously than any other living man (if so bold and undocumentable a statement may be allowed) has stumbled at the offence of the Cross, it is not surprising that he has never attended to the Resurrection, which cannot be intelligently viewed apart from its context, which is the Cross. I gather that Mr. Wells now sees no future for religion at all, certainly not for Christianity, and looks for no contribution from it to the "Shape of Things to come." With a relevance other than St. Paul exactly intended, and than Mr. Wells would accept, there might be written over his survey of the course of human life that lies ahead of us the words "If Christ be not risen from the dead then is your faith vain."

Very different from Mr. Wells is Mr. Middleton Murry. If his books on Jesus and on God may be taken as representing a probably permanent element in his outlook, one would say that his philosophy of life is Christo-centric. For him Jesus is the man who personally discovered the true secret and level of life, and as a teacher tried to make men realize that as He had attained so might they attain. What he cannot do with at all is the supernatural as Christians have understood it, and of the supernatural the, for him, utterly intolerable superlative is the Resurrection. The violence of his reference to it is very significant. Indeed, at this point violence seems to usurp the place of reason. Mr. Murry may say that if he were to find himself living in a universe in which an event so "stupid" as the bodily resurrection of Christ might happen, he would be simply revolted and would himself commit suicide. But if he were to believe that such a thing had happened (and others have passed

from doubt or unbelief to faith) he would neither pass so sweeping a judgment nor commit so desperate an act, but as a man of sense revise his conceptions of the meaning of existence. Where I think Mr. Murry may help us is in leading us by this passionate word of rejection, this Everlasting No of his, to see that it is not enough to set up the alternative Communism—"the one living religion in the western world today," as Mr. Murry describes it—or Christ as signifying contrasted ways of thought and life between which a decision must be made. We must not leave out the Resurrection-faith. Christianity means not just Christ the historic person, but the risen Christ who is more than a historic person, since He descends upon history, gives meaning to history, and is the end of history. Brunner's idea of super-history as present in Christ, the Word made flesh, is truer than Murry's idea of metabiology, as revealed in the historic Jesus. These are terrific words, and one may well wish to be saved from the trouble of trying to understand them. But they do stand for realities of interpretation, for the acceptance or rejection of a level of reality, the supreme level of reality, above all that we know as nature and history. Everything finally depends for Mr. Murry on the *ὁδὸς ἀνω*, man's way up, and can he find it; everything depends finally for Professor Brunner on the *ὁδὸς κάτω*, God's way down, and has He taken it. For Mr. Murry the introduction of the Resurrection is like the interpolation of a mischievous surd into an algebraical problem that otherwise could be brought to its proper solution. For the Professor it is the decisive *x* that we need in order to be able to make sense of the problem at all. The Resurrection for the one makes nonsense of the world; for the other it makes sense of the fact of Christ (and therefore of all else besides). "The Resurrection," says Brunner (*The Mediator*, p. 579), "is the *Telos*, the goal and the meaning of the life of Christ."

Here are real choices, real decisions, presented to us by the literary man and the theologian. But what are we to make of Mr. Aldous Huxley and his judgment upon the future of religion at the end of *Texts and Pretext*? "Religion," he says, "can, it seems, survive only as a consciously accepted system of make-belief." This he explains by reference to man's experience that to live in terms of a ritual rhythm, under certain ethical restraints, and as if certain metaphysical doctrines were true, is to live nobly and in style. Each art, so runs his last sentence, has its conventions, and the greatest of the arts is the art of living. It is hard to say what might not be psychologically possible—at least it is hard for one who is not a psychologist, but the metaphysical problem involved in the conscious confusion of belief and make-belief does seem insoluble. What, I

think, is quite clear is that there is no help in this religion of illusion against the horrors of Mr. Huxley's *Brave New World*. One of the queerest but most arresting sayings in that satire upon a world organized and controlled according to the boundless possibilities of applied science is that in which Mustapha Mond, the resident Word Controller for Western Europe, explains to the savage that while God probably exists He manifests Himself in a manner different from that which was the case in pre-modern times. Now, says Mustapha: "He manifests Himself as an absence; as though he weren't there at all." It may be that this paradoxical epigram hits off much that is a good deal nearer to us than is Mr. Huxley's new world. The sort of a something in which the Member of Parliament said that we all believed might as well be absent as present for all the value it was likely to have as an influence upon life, and there are people whose idea of God may not get beyond the opinion that when one has reached the furthest limits of real existence there is still something left over to which the name of God may be given. Indeed, I am not sure that we are better off if with Kirsopp Lake we deny that God is the Creator (since there is no Creator) and affirm that He is the totality of values. I dare say that values can be totalled, but why call the full sum God?

There is a pathetic interest in the attempts of some of our modern writers to keep religion alive and to preserve God's name even when the reality for which the name should stand would seem to have been strained away. They are convinced that the passing of religion would be a loss that could not be made good, and they do not want to see man suffering that loss. Their attitude is as anthropocentric as was Auguste Comte's, but they find it less possible than he did to make man the object of his own worship, and thus consciously to substitute humanity for God as the supreme reality of religion. Meanwhile, they turn their backs upon historic Christianity which does keep religion alive by reverencing truth, refusing to pervert belief into make-belief, and finding a moral and spiritual dynamic through faith in a living God who gave His Son to live and die, and—supreme testimony to His love and power—raised Him from the dead.

Statements and books of a non-Christian character such as those to which reference has been made assist us to understand the confidence of Hort and Acton. By Acton that confidence was expressed in terms too buoyant for us who have seen our world go, as it were, partly to pieces. The war shewed that man had not surrendered to the influence of Christ sufficiently to be saved from a destructive outbreak of the forces of fear, folly, and wickedness. But the revelation that has come by the negative way is tremendous for those who have eyes to see. The

need of Christ and of surrender to Him is greater than ever, and neither for Him nor for the surrender is there any substitute that promises the freedom of the spirit which is the indispensable foundation of all other freedom. Self-conscious political philosophies like Communism and Nazism stand condemned unless man's spiritual life, as the free and non-mechanical expression of personality, can be shewn to be an illusion. What I think we must say as a necessary amendment upon Acton's statement of his faith is that in the world of today the influence of Christ acts often as a challenge rather than directly. But where we must abide absolutely with Acton is in his definition of that influence as proceeding from the Christ who is risen. The challenge is not that of a dead teacher. It would, indeed, not be untrue to say that the wisdom of Socrates is a challenge to the folly, to the easy assumptions made in our present world, but the great Athenian's challenge comes to us from the past. But if we were to say that about Christ's challenge we should close our eyes to the most significant fact about it—namely, that great numbers of people are conscious of it as of the voice, the call of one who is alive, who is "here." He and His words are spirit and life as real, with that reality which belongs to living personality alone, as in those long-ago days when He and His words first broke into the world. In different ways is His voice and challenge heard, in Catholicism, in the Barthian theology, in the Oxford Group Movement. But however the voice sounds, those who hear it are at one in their conviction that this is the one eternal voice, which through all the ages is the voice of the living God speaking to man through Jesus Christ His Son, the Word of the Father, the redeeming Saviour, the risen and living Lord.

πολλὰ μὲν θνητοῖς φωναὶ μία δ' ἀθανάτοισι.

Mortals have many voices, the immortals but one.*

The influence of Christ is the influence of life, not of archæology. It acts upon the world through the Church, which from the first has been the fellowship of those who, whether or no disciples of Him during the days of His flesh, have believed that He rose from the dead. We must allow for the double truth that Christ is both reflected and obscured through that medium. The Church is His body, and in it His Spirit dwells; but the Church is made up of fallible and sinful men and women, so that the Light of the world is partly hidden from the world because the window through which it comes is not free from stains and dust. Yet even here gain comes through loss.

* With these words ends a lecture which I heard Dr. Sanday deliver at Cambridge, one of a course later published in the volume, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*.

Those often severe critics of the Church who contrast its imperfections with the loyalty that it owes to Christ think of Christ as offering a standard of good life for the Church, but also for the world, since their complaint is that the Church is not fulfilling the responsibility of illuminating and strengthening the world by its own expression of the excellence of Christ. What the critics fail to see is that such expression is possible only if the Church in its following of Christ is loyal to one who belongs in the fullest way not to the past only, but also to the present.

But the criticism is only a half-truth. The half-truth of the Church's failure in loyalty needs to be balanced by the fact that perhaps never was the Church trying harder to learn the way of loyalty than today. The conventional attachments of the past are dying. Convention in great matters is the enemy of the life of the spirit; it means the depersonalizing of what should be true and vital relationships. Christianity has certainly suffered much in that way. Yet behind the conventions, behind the stiff façade as it may have appeared of formal belief and ethical rule, the well of living water has never failed. And now over the whole field of human thought and activity Christians are more and more realizing that they are torchbearers who are called to shew Christ as the Light not of a corner of life labelled "religious," but of the world. The Easter Day greeting of the Eastern orthodox *Χριστὸς ἠγέρθη · ἠγέρθη ὁντως* (Christ is risen: He is risen indeed) is the word of power to which no limits can be set in respect of its adequacy for man's well-being. The deepening of personal devotion, the extension of evangelistic enterprise, the increasing emphasis laid upon the need and the value of Christian teaching, are born of the response, imperfect indeed, but full of hope, within the Church to the Christ who is risen. In Forster's life of Lowes Dickenson there is a letter that expresses Dickenson's "abiding difficulty" as to Christianity. He could not appreciate the connexion with Jesus which was fundamental in Christian religion. "What was Jesus like?" he asks. If one stays simply on the historical plane and takes the question as one that is wholly taken up with a figure of past history, it is obviously not a question that can be answered directly in one way only. Of no historical question of the first order is that true. But it is equally true that any answer which might be given from this standpoint would give us no more than that knowledge of Christ which St. Paul speaks of as the knowledge of Christ after the flesh, a knowledge about Christ involving no internal relation to Him. It is that internal relation which is the strength of the Church and of the humblest

Christian. And it is that present relation which is meaning more, not less. The Church grows into that fulness of which Browning wrote in the well-known lines:

That face, far from disappearing, grows,
Decomposes but to recompose,
Becomes my universe that feels and knows.

It is as the Christ who is risen is more deeply understood within the Church that the Church is enabled to preach Him to the world as the world's Redeemer. Conscious of its danger and its need of salvation, though far from realizing that the danger is primarily spiritual, and that the salvation, if it is to be had, must be spiritual, the world passes along the road of crisis near to the edge of the precipice. The crisis has been expounded clearly and penetratingly by the Roman Catholic interpreters Christopher Dawson and Peter Wust. The latter adopts from Dilthey the phrase "the anarchy of values" as descriptive of the state to which the world has come (*Crisis in the West*, p. 44); the former sees in the return to the historic Christian tradition the means for the restoration to our civilization of the "moral force that it requires in order to dominate external circumstances and to avoid the dangers that are inherent in the present situation" (*Progress and Religion*, p. 246). The constant questions which men ask about life concern its meaning and value. The ideals which they feel constrained to impose upon life, while yet they somehow arise out of life, are ideals of truth and righteousness. But whether the questions can be answered and whether the ideals can be attained—as to that there is much doubt. And we Christians can well understand that doubt, since we know that it would be ours did we not possess the victory over doubt in Him who is both personally the answer to the questions and the realization of the ideals. In Christ all that we may have to ask about meaning and purpose, about truth and goodness, receives its answer. There is a real way to be found and a real truth to be known—for He is the Way and the Truth. And, above and including all, there is life not for the measured and passing span of days and years, but life of an imperishable quality, life eternal, since He is the Life. But vain would it be to make such confidence our own and to refuse to share those doubts which we understand were it not that our belief is then most surely not make-belief when it is belief in Christ as risen.

I am sometimes not surprised at the view taken as to the approaching end of the age by Second Adventists, British Israelites, and those who find a secret, but detailed and intelligible, forecasting of history in the Great Pyramid. The

problem of the present is to an extraordinary extent the problem of the future. And in history the problem must work out to some solution. Christ or Chaos is not the true alternative, for Chaos, though it may come, cannot last. The Russian thinker Berdiaeff is far more in the right when, in the striking words which Aldous Huxley has quoted as an introduction to *Brave New World*, he sees the alternative as one between utopias which are realizable and towards which life marches and a society "not utopian, less 'perfect,' and more free." Acton's freedom becomes an ideal rather than a present fact. The Second Adventists and the others interpret the whole issue eschatologically; the problem is solved by supernatural intervention. And certainly they are not altogether wrong. History has its term, its further limit, and for the Christian that which lies beyond the limit is the Kingdom of God; and it does not matter whether for society as for the individual the limit should be revealed sooner rather than later. Yet we judge the Kingdom to be not simply eschatological. We do not find it easy to believe that the whole notion of a Kingdom of Christ upon earth, while Christ is still hidden (the eschatologists believe that there will be one when He is revealed), is an illusion. It is not as though the triumphs of the risen Christ had ceased. And if they are visible in the moral and spiritual life of individuals, then, in an age when the social implications of personality are so undeniable, how is it possible to say that in the order of the world, which is a redeemed world, there can be no manifestation of Christ as the reigning Lord until He come again?

Progress in history does not proceed along a straight road. It resembles more an uphill and spiral movement. And there are points on the road when neither the outlook nor the forward look is encouraging, when the landscape is bleak and the way is obscure. At such a point, and perhaps we are now arrived at it, confidence in a good and wise purpose immanent in the world order is hard to gain and keep; for the Christian that means that he must walk by a faith which very plainly is not sight. Yet never more certainly than at such a crisis does he see in every sign of hope the revelation of Christ as the Saviour who is risen. He can do his work and wait patiently for the fuller revelation that there is only one light of the world, and that that light is Christ.

J. K. MOZLEY.

THE CATHOLIC RENEWAL IN ITALY AND THE MISSION OF THE WALDENSIANS *

ITALY, renewing her national and social life, is yearning for a religious renewal whereby religion, instead of being reduced to an anachronism maintained by force of habit for purely decorative purposes, may constitute a fact for conscience and a living experience.

Speaking of religious renewal in relation to the Italian spirit, it must be said at once that there is no question of eliminating the spiritual-religious reality to which the faith of our people gives expression in its highest manifestations and substituting for it another of extraneous origin.

The only renewal that is possible and desirable in Italy is, on the contrary, that of a new and lively awareness of the Christian and Catholic principle immanent in her history, a sound valuation of her genuine religious heritage, and a developing of latent germs in contact with the creations of the spirit to be found in universal Christendom.

Thus equipped she may set forth, in full possession of her soul, and under the impulse of her own tradition purified and enriched, towards a loftier region of spiritual life, and become, in the hands of God, an ever more efficacious instrument to prepare the future of Christendom and the world for the advent of the Kingdom.

* * * * *

By what paths will she move? The Italian people is at once the most anti-clerical and the most catholic in the world. Hence its religious renewal can only come from the evolution and uplifting of its historic Church.

The Roman Church—even in the days when its human element was most corrupt—has always been able to radiate from its heart forces of renewal.

We need only record, by way of example, in one direction the Franciscan movement, and in another the School of Port Royal. In this Church there are two contrasted tendencies, the one towards coldness and a contracted life, the other towards renewal, intensification, and expansion. So, if it be asked whether the Roman Church in its present state is capable of renewal *ab intra*, a renewal determined by vital intrinsic powers, the answer must be in the affirmative. Only sectarian and fanatical spirits could give a summary judgment in the negative sense.

* * * * *

* We owe the translation of this Article to the kindness of the Ven. Lonsdale Ragg, D.D.

The premonitory signs of such a renewal as we have indicated are visible to anyone who is not content with a limited and one-sided examination of the facts or with a superficial judgment, but has the capacity and the opportunity of penetrating more deeply.

Most important is the liturgical renewal movement promoted by the Benedictines. The *lex supplicandi* is closely related to the *lex credendi*. Now, in contrast to the unwholesome devotions contained in certain books of devotion which, with the permission of the ecclesiastical authority, have so wide a vogue, the liturgical prayer-forms of the Missal and the Breviary (apart from secondary and later marginal additions) are serious, wholesome, virile and austere—"classical" in the Christian sense of the word.

The Benedictine movement renders the mystic liturgy accessible to the populace, and gives to the action of the liturgy an educative value.

Side by side, but independently, there is to be found an "Evangelical" movement, which vindicates ideas of the utmost importance that have been obscured in popular Catholicism. One of these ideas is that of a Church viewed not merely as a historic and juridical entity, but as a mystic force. According to the leaders of this Evangelical movement within the Roman Church, the true Christian life is only the life in Christ, and every Christian's vocation is to be—through the power of such life—a representative of Christ.

This movement, initiated in Italy a few years ago, combats that spirit of superstition which in practice gravely defiles the face of the Roman Church.

"There are devotions," wrote Mgr. Bonomelli, the lamented bishop of Cremona, "which are not worthy to be even named among us, yet are widely diffused: these are a dishonour to Catholic worship, and excite ridicule and contempt."*

In the first congress of this evangelical movement, held in Bologna, the Rev. Fr. Bevilacqua, in presence of the Cardinal Archbishop, made "a forcible attack on the distortions prevalent in the worship of the Saints."† He deplored the fact that, in general, "men neglect in their worship recourse to the Centre of Christendom, which is Christ." "And that," he adds, "because the Gospel is forsaken."

The boldest of the renewal movements in the Roman Church has two closely related aspects, the one cultural and the other ecclesiastical. The promoters (unlike the heterodox Modernists)

* *Fogli Autunnali*, p. 332.

† *Il Momento*, September 6, 1925.

admit all the dogmas defined by the Church of Rome, but conceive a new valuation of the values of dogma in general for life.

Again, while they uphold the principle of authority and unity characteristic of that Church, they look for an entirely new ecclesiological conception and a transformation in the exercise of the Church's authority, as a result of a new Christian experience. They think that their attitude—in which obedience is not that of the slave but of the son (at once much more and much less than the former)—will prepare for a period of greater intellectual liberty and of richer culture in the Church.

The complex of activities making for renewal that is being developed in the bosom of the Church by many of her most cultured, most broad-minded and most pious sons may in the future achieve co-ordination with a movement in the State: the reform of the Italian public school on its religious side.

The Italian State has become aware of the importance of religion in the formation of the national spirit, in relation to those ethical ends to which no state worthy of the name can shew itself indifferent.

Italy is confronted with a religious problem which demands solution: and the Italian State—which is essentially ethical—seeks to bring about such a solution along the lines of the spiritual tradition of the country, *sub specie vite*.

This was tersely and vividly expressed by the Minister of National Education, the Hon. Balbino Giuliano, in a speech delivered on October 10, 1929, before the members of the *Consiglio Superiore dell' Educazione Nazionale*. "The Government," he said, "cannot fail to see the importance of the religious question in cultural life. Too long Italy has been hesitating between a passive acceptance of orthodoxy and a materialistic negation. Today he that looks deeply into our affairs perceives that the nation is facing her religious problem: the problem, that is, of finding in the Faith that represents her tradition of orthodoxy a living flame which shall raise to greater power her gift of ideal creativeness."

It goes without saying that the first steps towards the realization of this programme are very defective; that the means employed to reach the end in view are inadequate and inappropriate to the object. There can be no doubt that—if it is to correspond with the character of a State that is essentially ethical, and historically, but not theologically, Catholic—the process must have many errors corrected and many elements transformed that belong to the extremely imperfect beginnings of a beneficent revolution.

The aim of religious instruction in the public schools is to

spread religious culture among the laity, and spread it abroad as an aspect of general culture.

In the primary school religious teaching should be directed towards rousing in the children's minds the religious sense of life: in the secondary it should with full serenity give the pupils historic and doctrinal information on the nature and office of religion in general, on the historic religion of their own people, on the influence it has exerted upon the national spirit, and on its highest expressions, spiritual, moral and æsthetic: bringing into relief the services that can be demanded of religion with free choice and acceptance after it has been grasped as an instrument of the life of the conscience.

Finally, in the universities it should rise to the dignity of philosophical, critical, and comparative research concerning the salient manifestations of the religion as a fact.

When the educational revolution just initiated in Italy shall have attained these proportions, and when, by its means, religious culture shall have become instrumental in the rebirth of the Christian ideal: then the various movements of renewal of which we have spoken—movements that are at work in the bosom of the Roman Church, but from the necessity of the case are limited to narrow circles, embracing only nuclei of the elect—will acquire the possibility of vastly wider and deeper repercussions.

* * * * *

In very close relation with the Catholic renewal of the New Italy stands the work which is being accomplished by the Waldensians. They are of Provençal origin, and date from the twelfth century. By their fusion with the followers of Arnold of Brescia their movement acquired at once a greater boldness and precision, and an essentially Italian character. At the beginning of its career it was an ethico-spiritual and disciplinary movement aiming at moral reform in the Church and the restoration of spiritual dignity to the clergy. It was a forerunner of the Franciscan movement, which embodies profound Waldensian elements. Waldensianism drew the inspiration of its activity from the Bible, and hence the contrast between the Bible and the superstitions in vogue in the Church set the Waldensian movement against such superstitions. It does not, however, at that epoch, shew any clear-cut lines of a specific dogmatic position.

In the sixteenth century, after the outburst of the Protestant revolution, the movement aligned itself with the Protestant movement, and became fused with it. This took place officially in 1532 at Cianforan, a little commune in the Val d'Angrogna near Turin. Then Waldensianism not only

enriched its content by the acceptance of the Protestant (*i.e.*, Evangelical) principle, but did something further, which it need not have done. To provide for its own charismatic needs it organized itself as a Reformed Church (Communion), and became the little Italian Evangelical Church.

This is not the place to speak of this Church, because, as a Church, it does not enter into the movement of internal renewal in the Roman Church which is the subject of this article. But we hasten to point out that Waldensianism, when it became a "Church," did not definitely lose the character of a "movement." On the contrary, in recent times, as soon as its circumstances rendered such a thing possible, it has begun to resume (without ceasing to be a particular Church) its ancient character of an intrinsic movement in the religious life of Italy considered as a whole.

In order to realize the possibility of this, it is necessary to remember that the Church is not merely, or primarily, an institutional and juridical organism, but, in its inner reality, a mystical force (*valore*). Hence it follows that two particular Churches, though divided as to their external organisms, and in theological and other points, are one Church in that mystical essence which is their inner reality in so far as they hold belief in the dogmatic truth essential to Christianity and the faith in Christ as Saviour, and are nourished by the Word of God contained in the Gospel, and draw life from the Holy Spirit.

Intimately aware of this fact, Waldensianism has come to realize its own solidarity, intrinsic, solid and vital, with the Catholic Church; and sets itself to radiate around it the principle which lies at the foundation of such experience, making it clear that such a principle, though overlaid with confining and hindering elements, is not entirely extraneous to the most orthodox Roman doctrine.

In this way Waldensianism is increasingly producing a condition of things in which it will be possible for her to speak and find a hearing as one of the voices of the rich and complex soul of the One Church, and so to support the Catholic renewal with its own characteristic *charisma*.

* * * * *

The *charisma* which the Waldensian movement can so introduce is the Evangelical principle of Protestantism. We must of course distinguish this principle from the Protestant Churches which are associated with the Reformation of the sixteenth century. For these contain elements other than the Evangelical principle—*viz.*, the faults inevitable in an historic movement of revolt, the mental peculiarities and idiosyncrasies of individual Reformers, the characteristics of race,

the particular genius of the nation taking part in the Reformation, with their qualities, positive and negative, not to speak of other accidental factors.

So that, in the events of the sixteenth century, we must not confuse the truth-value of the Evangelical principle with the contingent elements and phases of the Reformed Churches.

One of the characteristics of the true Evangelical principle is the religion of conscience as opposed to the religion of magic: an intimate purifying and elevating force which has repercussions in the ethical sphere, substituting for the passive morals of habit the conscientious performance of duty, felt as such, in its austere purity.

With this is associated the idea of religion as an experience, in opposition to dogmatism—not, of course, to dogma. For Christian dogma is the truth-aspect of the life-fact in the perfect experience of Jesus, which it is our vocation to live again; while dogmatism is the attribution of saving power to an abstract idea: so substituting for life itself a theory of life.

Central to the religion of conscience and of experience is the knowledge and the possession of God in Christ. Hence what in some sense may be called the culminating aspect of the Evangelical principle—the sovereignty of the Gospel.

The Gospel is not the Book, but the message which the Book contains: and as the message is one with the Messenger, the Gospel is the Person of Jesus Christ, the fountain of life.

The Evangelical principle does not deny the relations, intimate and important, between the inspired Evangelical Scriptures and other documents of the true tradition; but affirms that the New Testament contains all the essential data of the Apostolic consciousness.

Free research or enquiry in the Evangelical principle must not be confused with the private judgment of the individual, who browses on the divine mysteries to cull the essence of Gospel dogma without a sound objective criterion by which to guide himself. This is the working method of the sects which have grown up on the fringe of Protestantism: it is not the Evangelical principle. That principle, on the contrary, recognizes the value of a tradition which illuminates the dogmatic matter of the Gospel in such a way as to avoid the aberrations of private judgment and attain to judgments objectively solid and universal. The right of free research affirmed in the Evangelical principle may be thus expressed: As every Christian has a vocation to live again the Gospel, he needs must identify himself with it, and make it his own by an act at once spontaneous and voluntary. The truth, if it is to save a soul—that is, to purify and renew it—must be not only apprehended and

comprehended but assimilated. Free research, therefore, is nothing but the necessary collaboration of the personality of the believer with Scripture and the Church in such wise that the Christ of God and of history becomes also the Christ of the soul.

With it is bound up Evangelical "personalism," not to be confounded with *individualism*. The individual, incomplete in himself, finds his perfection in functioning as an organ of the whole: but in this act of self-giving, far from suffering annihilation, he emerges as a personality, in that, instead of merging himself in the life of the whole, he re-lives it as his own experience. The accentuation of this "personalism" stamps a special character on the functioning of the Church, freeing the exercise of her authority from the taint of despotic authoritarianism. In close connexion with "personalism" stands, in the Evangelical principle, salvation by faith; salvation, that is, not by external, superficial acts, but by the more personal and interior act, at once active and receptive, which is the condition under which Christ, by the power of the Holy Spirit, penetrates the recesses of the soul, and, investing it with the roots of the totality of our being, makes of the believer "a new creature."

For lack of space I have been able to indicate only a few aspects of the Evangelical principle, which supplies the possible contribution of Waldensianism to the Catholic renewal of Italy.

* * * * *

But can we go so far as to say that there exist Protestant possibilities in Roman Catholicism?

Some time ago a priest as pious as he was learned, and at the time professor in an ecclesiastical academy, wrote to me as follows:

"One of the tasks of modern Catholic theology, imposed on her by the designs of Providence with regard to the future of the Christian Church, as manifested by many unmistakable signs, will be that of studying and bringing to light the degree to which Roman Catholicism, without losing its essential character, can find place in her own life for the truth of the Protestant principle."

These words imply that Roman Catholicism can shew itself receptive in relation to that principle.

To avoid misunderstanding we must add at once that such receptivity, in the minds of those who affirm it, does not signify in the least that the Roman Church is capable of transforming itself into a Protestant Church: such a supposition would be more than ridiculous. We have already said that it is only the *principle* of Evangelical Protestantism that has a

universal value, and that in the Protestant Churches this principle does not and cannot exist in a pure state, but is, so to speak, concretely incarnated in an institutional form which as regards many of its elements has a merely contingent value, relative to the individual character of those Churches.

But the receptivity attributed to the Roman Church is the possibility of incorporating the universal Evangelical principle in an incarnation diverse from that of all the Protestant Churches because embodied in a profoundly diverse institutional form.

When the Roman Church shall have achieved such an acceptance of the Evangelical principle, she will remain essentially the same in her theologico-ecclesiastical reality, but enriched by the assimilation of that principle in the modes and forms that harmonize with her genius. That is to say, while on the one hand this principle will, in the modes and forms in which it actualizes itself, be subjected to the influence of Roman Catholicism, on the other hand it will, in virtue of its essential qualities, enrich the Roman Church.

But is this possible in face of the constitution, the definitions, and the claims of the Roman Church, with its ecclesiastical hierarchy and its Papal Infallibility?

Our answer is that the Roman Church implies a religion, and therefore a religious experience. Now in religious experience there is a momentum of the spirit in which, when the spirit becomes aware of a contradiction between its own experience and certain forms that have consolidated themselves in the frame of the historic Church, it tends to transform these in the degree necessary to establish a new equilibrium among the different constituent elements of the ecclesiastical fabric. This element of the spirit, inherent in religious experience, is insuppressible. Certain dogmatic definitions which seem to constitute an insuperable obstacle to such a process, in reality have no such character and force.

It is noticeable that the gravest of all such definitions—that of the Infallibility of the Pope—is understood and interpreted by theologians in most diverse senses, all of which have free course within the Church.

Examining these, one is vividly impressed with the idea that the definition in question may even be susceptible of a reinterpretation that shall give it a place within the framework of true Catholic orthodoxy. What exact form such a reinterpretation may take one cannot pronounce *a priori*: only one has the feeling that it may be possible.

What is essential is that the soul of the Roman Church

should evolve: the rest will follow along the avenues which Providence shall have prepared and opened up.

From all this it follows that the Waldensian movement—which receives from its history the obligation to contribute its characteristic *charisma* to the Catholic renewal of Italy—will discharge this duty *sub specie universalitatis* when the Italian religious renewal has made Rome once more the universal fatherland of Christian humanity.

In that day three diverse great Knights of the Ideal—St. Francis of Assisi, Peter Valdo, and Arnold of Brescia—will together achieve their apotheosis under the gleaming skies of Italy.

UGO JANNI.

SAN REMO,

May, 1934.

MR. MORE, LIBERAL CATHOLICS AND THE INCARNATION

AN important paper by Mr. Paul Elmer More, the distinguished American philosopher and critic, appearing in a recent number of *THEOLOGY* (March, 1933), under the title of "Liberal Catholics and the Incarnation," appears to be directed against several earlier articles and a number of books by thinkers of the liberal (or, if you will, "modernist") school of Anglo-Catholics, and more especially against essays by Dr. F. L. Cross, of Pusey House, Oxford (in *The Hibbert Journal* for April, 1932), and the present writer (in *THEOLOGY* for December, 1931, and later in *The American Church Monthly*). In this brief paper, an attempt will be made to shew that Mr. More has failed to understand the main line of our argument, and further that he has not succeeded in proving that the position, in so far as he has grasped it, departs in any essential way from Catholic faith and life, different as it may be from certain emphases in older formulations of the central fact and experience of Christianity.

Mr. More has certainly given us a valuable and exquisitely written statement of his own view. In the course of his essay, one strange and purely personal view of Mr. More's appears—a denial of the omnipotence of God in an effort to maintain his goodness. This is not the place to discuss the problem of a finite God; suffice it to say that Catholic theology has always felt itself bound to insist that God is both ultimate power and absolute goodness, and that historically no finite God has for very long satisfied the requirements of the religious consciousness. How God's omnipotence and his goodness are to be reconciled

we may not know; but the belief that they can be reconciled is the basis for any sound Christian theology.

But to turn to that part of Mr. More's paper which criticizes liberal Catholic Christology. And first of all to comment on the line of approach. Our critic begins his study with a consideration of man and his spiritual faculties, and then projects these on the universe; he refers again and again to human inference, and suggests that faith may be equated with this inferential activity of man. It is implied that the creature is always "working towards" God, excepting at one place where God has come through into history—the Incarnation in Christ. Mr. More may not mean this, and much else in his paper is strongly against such a view; yet he suggests that this position is influencing him. And clearly the catastrophic Incarnation theology is very different from historic Catholicism.

The liberal Catholic (here following, it would seem, the best theological tradition of the Church) holds that there is an objective activity of Deity throughout the whole creation, and that God is available for our experience quite apart from the single event of the Incarnation in Christ. If this were not so, that event would have no significance whatsoever. Unless the revelation in our Lord is part of a more general revelational work of God it is merely a stupendous marvel, explaining nothing and simply astounding us as "a bolt from the blue." But at its best, as von Hügel so often insisted, Catholicism has taught that God is ever revealing and expressing Himself, that He is quite really present in our every experience, and that He is prevenient to all our seeking of Him. *Tu ne me chercherais si tu ne me possédais.* Man cannot and does not worship an inference nor an inferred Deity; he can and does adore a Reality given in experience, and not in religious experience only, but in the whole range of our rich and many-graded contact with the world.

With such a conception of a self-revealing God who calls forth our response by His prior activity and who is present and working throughout the created world, the way is prepared for the belief in degrees of manifestation of Reality, or of grades of divine self-revelation. It is in terms of such a world-view that the Incarnation may best be understood today.

Here it should be made perfectly clear that the liberal or "modernist" Catholic accepts with his whole heart the truth that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. He has no desire whatsoever to water down what is central in the experience of historic Christianity—that in our Lord Jesus Christ the Divine Word of God has been made flesh and has dwelt among us, full of grace and truth; and that from Him we receive

the fulness of the divine life. But acceptance of the fact of the Incarnation of God in Christ is a very different matter from acceptance of any specific theory of the mode of that Incarnation. Provided that the full deity and the full humanity of Christ and the perfect union of the two effected in Him are loyally maintained, the question of how this can be is open for discussion and study. Chalcedon stated the fact, as Mr. More says, "in hard, precise, uncircumventible terms." But Chalcedon's work was negative; it ruled out adoptionist and docetic heresies, but gave no positive statement concerning the manner of God's becoming man in Christ, nor did it discuss the relationship between our Lord as God-Man and ourselves as indwelt by the divine life. It put the problem; it did not provide the answer.

Furthermore, the liberal Catholic does not for one moment believe, as Mr. More seems to imply, that "Jesus had merely a clearer consciousness of a divine element in His being, a completer comprehension of the relation of the *logistikon* of man to the Logos of God" than that which may be found in other men. Indeed, the modern theologian would not argue so much from any supposed God-consciousness of Jesus as from those things which our Lord has effected and still effects in the lives of men. The liberal thinker whom Mr. More attacks would affirm gladly as the essence of his faith that in Christ "the Logos actually abode in (the) human nature in such wise that, besides being man, He was God." This is Mr. More's own statement. But the acceptance of such a faith is surely not incompatible with the recognition that, so long as the fact of the God-Man is not denied, there may be different ways of understanding that "abiding" of the Logos in the human nature of Jesus Christ.

It is alleged that some Liberal Catholics are confused in their thought as to whether the difference between the divine presence and activity in Christ and that presence and activity in men generally is one of degree or kind. It is an old problem, and we cannot enlarge on it here. As Dr. Temple once shewed, it results eventually in the ridiculous question of "whether the difference between a difference of degree and kind is itself a difference of degree or kind"—a nice logical issue. It must suffice to say that (at least for the present writer) the whole idea of absolute difference in kind is meaningless in this connection. God's whole revealing work is incarnational in nature, in mode, in kind. There are no different sorts of Deity; God is "all of a piece," but is expressed in differing degrees of intensity.

There is complete continuity throughout the revelatory process, but not a levelling; uniqueness within continuity is not a self-contradictory concept. We agree with Canon

Streeter's statement, in his recently published Bampton Lectures, that historically the isolation of "the divine Sonship of Christ from the potentiality in other men 'to become sons of God' has defeated the attempt to produce a satisfactory doctrine of the Incarnation." We may even say (with Chancellor Bezzant) that our Lord is actually what all men are potentially. He is the embodiment of God's purpose for every one of us, and His uniqueness rests in His supremely full disclosure of that purpose and His power to effect it among men. He manifests the eternal nature of God, and also the real nature of man, as *capax deitatis*. That is why we are compelled to affirm that in Him God has come among us in special fulness and has given us of His very self; that He is God-Man, *Deitas sub specie humanitatis*.

Here we must guard carefully against a misunderstanding. No attempt is made by liberal Catholics to equate God and man. The two are quite other; and yet eternity and time are in ever-increasing interpenetration as time becomes the more adequate instrument or *organon* of eternity. God works in and through His creation, but He is not to be confused with it. Nor is the view here presented fairly described as teaching that Christ is only the supreme point in the immanent movement up to God. Of course He is that, but first and foremost He is the climax of God's long-continued process of self-impartation to man. His Incarnation is the focal point of two movements—God's search for man, and man's search for God. But the former is the initial movement, since God's activity is always *prevenient* to our response. The position cannot be identified with immanentism; it is through and through incarnational.

Thus the historic Incarnation, although seen as part of a general "incarnational movement," is saved from relegation to the limbo of mythology (in the modern sense); it is no *mere* symbolic representation. In one sense it is symbolic representation, but it is much more than that—it is objective history, and it is also the guarantee of the whole incarnation process, because it is the concentration of that process at one point in human experience. The historic fact and its results are therefore the crown and the criterion of the entire world-system as we know it; they are central and normative, "the implied goal and centre," in von Hügel's phrase, of all natural-supernatural activity and experience.

Furthermore, the Incarnation effects what it manifests; it brings men, already sharers in the divine nature, into that closer and more intimate union objectively actualized in Christ, and it does this by making them members of the extended life of Christ in the world, the Holy Catholic Church. Our Lord is

to be regarded (as Dr. D. M. Edwards suggests in his *Christianity and Philosophy*) as "the living meeting-point of heaven and earth, of God and man, the keystone of the cosmic arch, the culmination at once of emergent evolution working 'upwards' and of divine self-impartation working 'downwards,' at once the summit of human achievement and the supreme gift of love, whereby God gives 'His very self and essence all-divine.'"

Finally, the position here defended does not involve a denial of the certainly obvious fact that the complete actualization of the incarnation movement in the historic Incarnation brought new factors into our human world. Christ and His Church form a complex which is an emergent, not a mere resultant, in this many-graded world-system. In that emergent, some fresh force or quality, previously only adumbrated and partially realized among men, was brought into history. St. John Damascene wrote of the historic Incarnation as "a new thing, the newest of all new things, the only really new thing under the sun"; and in a profound sense, this is true. It is precisely what might be expected; when the full advent of Godhead into humanity was achieved in Christ, a new kind of life was made available for men, of an unimaginable richness and depth. This is the guarantee of the real uniqueness, supremacy and adequacy of our Lord and His work for us.

What the liberal or "modernist" Catholic, whom Mr. More criticizes, wishes to do is to state the Incarnation fact and doctrine in a way which will not only be adequate to the abiding experience of the Christian community and the facts which have evoked that experience; but will also give the most satisfactory clue to the understanding of the whole system in which that Incarnation has occurred. We believe that the theory that the world is the scene of an incarnational process culminating in Christ and His Church, and thence carried on to completion in the "inclusive Christ," is both loyal to Catholic tradition and capable of providing our best insight into the nature of the created world, and especially of man, and of God's work therein.

We may conclude this paper with a quotation from Dr. Friedrich Heiler's still untranslated *Im Ringen um die Kirche*. In the course of a significant discussion of the theology of von Hügel, that prophet of modern liberal Catholicism, Heiler writes: "All genuine religion is for Hügel not purely transcendent but in a manner *incarnational*. The descent of the Divine into creaturely limitations is universal, but it is accomplished in the greatest purity and fulness in the man Jesus, into whom the Divine Nature entered so far as was possible in a truly human nature. The Incarnation of God is rather a universal fact, in so far as the Divine revelation is universal and embraces all the

religions of the world. . . . Moreover, the full Incarnation of Christ is not limited to the historical appearance of Jesus, but concerns the whole Church, which, as the 'Body of Christ,' implies the continued Incarnation of the Son of God."

Such a wide interpretation of the faith is perfectly legitimate, we believe, and it is for precisely this that the liberal Catholic would contend. To Mr. More's criticism of the position we would answer, respectfully but firmly, "Not proven."

W. NORMAN PITTENGER.

A NOTE

UNIVERSAL sympathy will be felt for Dr. W. K. Lowther Clarke, who has had a serious accident while on his holiday in Northumberland. At one time it was feared that amputation of a leg might be necessary. That danger seems to have passed, but he will have a long and difficult convalescence, and some degree of permanent lameness. In all this he will be borne up by the sincere sympathy of very many attached and grateful friends. His singular gifts "of knowledge, of longsuffering, of kindness, of the Holy Ghost" are such that, when the time comes for him to be at work again, "the abundant grace will through the thanksgiving of many redound to the glory of God."

S. C. C.

MISCELLANEA

CORRESPONDENCE

ALMSGIVING AND THE CHURCH OVERSEAS

SIR,

Without wishing in any way to shirk the implications of Dr. Lyttelton's searching article in the July issue of *THEOLOGY*, I venture to suggest that the chief cause of our failure to respond to the call of *With One Accord* lies deeper than any change in social habits or customs.

The support of Missions overseas has always been a difficult problem, because such support demands, more definitely than that of any other "good work," a whole-hearted belief in Christ and belief in Christianity as a supernatural religion. The very mixed reasons for which many people contribute to religious and philanthropic work at home do not apply—or only to a very small extent—to the support of Missions.

It is undeniable, as Dr. Lyttelton says, that many earnest Churchpeople are hindered from adequate giving by the present-day social conventions and customs, but even if these hindrances were removed it is doubtful whether Missions would be very much better off, for the simple reason that there are not enough earnest Churchpeople to go round.

Nearly thirty years' experience, in various parts of England, as a "home worker" for Missions has convinced me that the root of the difficulty lies in the appalling amount of "nominal Churchmanship" and the lack of understanding of what is involved by membership in the Church. Instead of proclaiming the essentially corporate and missionary nature of Christianity, we have left the duty of helping Missions to a mere handful of faithful people in each parish, and now that the work overseas has grown, beyond our dreams, far beyond the power of those self-denying few to support, we are compelled to retrench instead of advancing. Every local secretary knows the difficulty of keeping the contributions up to last year's level, without any Utopian visions of 10 per cent. increase, simply because the circle of missionary-hearted people is so small.

A rural dean with a wide parochial experience said to me in discussing this question, "The whole trouble is due to the apathy of the incumbents." I believe that the missionary societies are of the same opinion, but find it difficult to say so. Probably lay-folk are also to blame. It requires a good deal of moral courage to take the initiative in face of opposition or indifference, or to "bear witness" in our modern un-Christian social life, and moral courage is not as a rule our strong point.

There are, however, many who are convinced that Missions will never be adequately supported, either by prayer, alms, or personal service, until we cease to rely on special appeals and deputations and "stunts," and devote more time and energy to helping people to acquire a vital religion which they will want to share with others, and a sense of responsibility—and of pride—as members of a world-wide Church.

Yours faithfully,

E. M. BULLOCK.

NOTES

THE BAPTISMAL PATTERN IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

§ 1.

It is possible, by working on the earlier Pauline epistles, to isolate certain elements which are of still earlier origin. These belong to the general tradition of the gentile mission of the Christian church, and were "received" by Paul. There are several definite allusions in 1 Thess. There are the classical passages in 1 Corinthians, besides one or two hints. And Rom. xii. to xiv., though thoroughly Pauline, is full of earlier material.

But it is in Col. and the "sub-pauline" epistles that we find the richest store-house of this material. The likenesses which exist between Eph., 1 Pet., and Jas. are not to be explained by borrowings from the Pauline writings, though we may concede that something of the kind has happened here and there. The verbal echoes which occur are too delicate and subtle to be totally accounted for in this way. They also tend to occur in a definite order, which suggests what may be called a pattern. *This pattern is the baptismal pattern (didactic and ritual) of the Christian gentile mission.*

The vocabulary characteristic of this pattern is not that of Paul; nor is it that of the synoptic gospels. It is characteristic of the points where these sub-pauline documents echo one another; and in each document the points in question act as key-words, and form a definite pattern.

§ 2.

A short outline of the pattern may be obtained by studying four words.

(a) ἀποθέσθαι* (Col. iii. 8; Eph. iv. 22, 25; 1 Pet. ii. 1; Jas. i. 21). This word means "to put off from oneself," and carries here the special connotation of putting off clothes, as is made clear by Paul, who follows it up with the antithetical verb, ἐνδυσάσθαι, "to put on." This verb, in its mystical sense, is peculiar to Paul (twelve times).

Taking off the clothes is a necessary preliminary to immersion; and it is natural to see in them a symbol of the old sins or the old self that is rejected. This step had already been taken in the Levitical purifications from which baptism is ultimately derived.

(b) ὑποτασσέσθαι (Col. iii. 18; Eph. v. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 13, v. 5; Jas. iv. 7). This word means "to submit oneself to," and serves in Col., Eph., and 1 Pet. to introduce a code of social duties which is generally recognized to be drawn from Jewish sources.

(c) γρηγορεῖτε (Col. iv. 2; Eph. vi. 18; 1 Pet. [iv. 7], v. 8; Jas. [missing]). This word means "to watch"; its other occurrences are very interesting, but the phenomena are too complicated to analyse here.

(d) στήτε or ἀντίστητε (Col. iv. 12; Eph. vi. 11; 1 Pet. v. 9, 12; Jas. iv. 7). The verbs "stand" or "resist" are not, of course, peculiar to these passages or characteristic of them; but the references in Eph., 1 Pet., and Jas. are the only cases where ἀντιστήναι is linked with the noun διάβολος;

* Also in Acts vii. 58, of clothes; and in Rom. xiii. 12 and Heb. xii. 1 in a context similar to this. It appears once in each of our documents (the repetition in Eph. is resumptive), and each time in the same context.

and the command to resist the devil is one of the most striking of the many phrases which are common to the sub-pauline documents.

It will be noted that in (c) and (d) there are two references in 1 Pet.; and this tends to support the theory that in 1 Pet. two epistles have been fused, 1 Pet. A giving us (a), (b), and (c); 1 Pet. B giving us (b), (c), and (d).

It will also be noted that (a) and (b) occur in Rom. xiii., though in reverse order, and that (a), (b), and (c) occur in Heb.; in both instances the writer is drawing upon the baptismal pattern.

§ 3.

Further elements in the baptismal tradition at once become obvious if the outline as presented in the last paragraph is accepted.

1. In Rom. and Eph. (a) is followed by lyrical passages on the motif of darkness and light; the same symbolism is also found in 1 Thess. v., an epistle which contains a good deal of this baptismal material in a disorganized manner. The Hebrew word *toḥārah*, which means illumination, is also used of Levitical purity; the Mishnah Tractate which deals with uncleanness and baptisms is called *Toharoth*. The newly baptized Christians have passed out of the darkness and defilement of the heathen world into the realm of light and purity; this is the meaning of Paul's word "sanctification." The exhortation to "put on" the "armour of light" makes a quick transition from the thought of "putting off" (a) to the battle against the powers of darkness (d).

2. We now come to separate phrases which appear to have no fixed place in the pattern. The comparison of the newly baptized to an infant is found in the Rabbinic writings: "The proselyte is as a new-born child." In the epistles this is supplemented by the thought of his growth in wisdom until he reaches adult status; he becomes "perfect" (τέλειος) or a "perfect man."

3. The Hebrew word *gēr* meant originally a stranger, but later came to be applied to the proselyte. Both uses are found in the epistles. Eph. says that the gentile Christians are no longer *gērim* but fellow-citizens with the saints, and οἰκεῖοι (home-born). 1 Pet. addresses them as strangers and pilgrims (*gēr haggār*).^{*} This distinction is of great interest, and argues a basic distinction in the provenance of the documents. Another case of such distinction is that for the Hebrew *halākah* (walking) in the moral sense: Paul prefers the verb περιπατεῖν; 1 Pet. always has the noun ἀναστροφή;† James follows 1 Pet.

Many other cases at once suggest themselves: the promise of the crown of life for instance. One quite certain case is προσωποληψία‡ (the respecting of persons). But it is impossible to carry this part of the investigation further within the limits of this article.

§ 4.

The word *halākah*, already used, is a Hebrew word used by the Rabbis to cover instruction on behaviour, whether in ritual or moral matters; for they knew of no such distinction. The Christian *halākah* of the epistles

* "The stranger that sojourneth."

† Used twice by Paul: Gal. i. 13, Eph. iv. 22 (1 Tim. iv. 12). περιπατεῖν in 1 Pet. is only used of the devil.

‡ προσωποληψία and kindred words, once in each of our authorities, Rom. ii. 11, Col. iii. 25, Eph. vi. 9, 1 Pet. i. 17, James ii. 1. The only other case in N.T. is Acts x. 34, a narrative of a baptism of a *gēr*!

is, much of it, a development of Jewish *halākah*. The moral exhortations, with their poetical form, are similar to those found in such Jewish works as the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, or the Two Ways, a Jewish catechism used by the Christian authors of the Didache and Barnabas. Similar Jewish material is also to be found in Hermas, and there are striking parallels between Ephesians and the so-called Zadokite work. Behind these various documents there existed, no doubt, still simpler Jewish catechisms.

With regard to ceremonial taboos, the apostolic triad of Acts xv. (fornication, blood, idol-sacrifices) appears in an attenuated form in Paul as fornication, uncleanness and covetousness which is idolatry. There are Jewish parallels to this also.

Christian *halākah*, then, did not owe everything to the gospel. It took over and transformed Jewish catechetical teaching, traces of which still remain; and this, in its turn, would appear to be based on Lev. xix. and the Law of Holiness of which that chapter is a part.

§ 5.

With regard to our documents: Col., we know, is written to a church Paul has never seen; it is probably a new church. He writes it a baptismal epistle on the lines of the accepted tradition. Eph. expands Col. into a catholic epistle, giving a fuller presentation of the great apostle's version of the common pattern. On the same lines is produced the Petrine version of the same tradition, addressed to the elect* proselytes (*gērim*) of the diaspora. In Jas. we have the Jacobean version for Jews, "to the twelve tribes of the diaspora."

Heb. is an attempt to leave behind the elementary Christian instruction (vi. 1), and enter on more advanced teaching; but it, too, reflects the baptismal pattern.

If these views are accepted, they provide definite motives for the production of these epistles, and a specific background and condition of affairs which will help us to understand them.

PHILIP CARRINGTON.

JULIUS AFRICANUS: A LETTER TO ORIGEN ON THE STORY OF SUSANNA

THE GREEK TEXT, EDITED WITH INTRODUCTION, TRANSLATION AND
NOTES BY E. H. BLAKENEY, M.A.

THE following notice of Julius Africanus occurs in St. Jerome's *de viris illustribus*:

Julius Africanus, cujus quinque de temporibus¹ extant volumina, sub Imperatore M. Aurelio Antonino² qui Macrino successerat, legationem pro instauratione urbis Emmaus³ suscepit, quae postea Nicopolis appellata est. Hujus est epistola ad Origenem super quaestione Susannae: eo quod dicat in Hebraeo hanc fabulam non haberi nec convenire cum Hebraica etymologia ἀπὸ τοῦ σχίνου σχίσαι, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πρίνου πρίσαι, contra quem doctam epistolam scribit Origenes. Extat ejus ad Aristidem altera epistola, in qua super διαφωνία⁴, quae videtur esse in genealogia Salvatoris apud Matthaeum et Lucam, plenissime disputat.

* I.e., proselytes who were also Christians.

NOTES ON THE ABOVE

1. See the remarks, under the "Reign of Gordian" (A.D. 238-244), in Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, vi. 31, where he speaks of the "five books of Chronographies, a monument of labour and accuracy."

2. Generally known as Elagabalus (Heliogabalus): he defeated and slew Macrinus in the year 218.

3. Probably not the Emmaus of Luke xxiv., but a city in the Shefelah of Palestine.

4. "discord" (or "discrepancy" as we might now say). Somewhat similar use in Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, vii. 887, and cf. Eusebius, *loc. cit.*, where he too remarks that the genealogies of Matthew and Luke διαφωρεῖν νομίζονται τοῖς πολλοῖς. For the letter to Aristides see Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, i. 7.

We may fix the date of Africanus' birth somewhere about 170. He was probably an officer in the Roman army, and served in one of the expeditions of the Emperor Septimius Severus. From Emmaus, which he later on made his home, he went on a mission to the Emperor Elagabalus, to persuade him to permit the rebuilding of the town: apparently he was successful. His death took place about 243. The letter to Origen appears to be the only one of his voluminous writings which has come down to us complete. It was occasioned by the fact that Origen had quoted the history of Susanna as part of the Hebrew Canon. Africanus joined issue on this point, maintaining that the book was, from the first, Greek, not Hebrew (Bigg, *The Origins of Christianity*, p. 444). He disputes the genuineness of the story on critical grounds and (says Gwatkin, *Church History*, ii. 196) has the advantage of Origen, who merely pleads the authority of the LXX, and is "not shaken even by the double pun which to most minds is clinching proof that it was written in Greek."

Farrar (*Lives of the Fathers*) speaks of Africanus' brief but trenchant letter as one of the most precious specimens of the critical spirit in the early centuries. For notices of his life and writings the student may be referred to Cruttwell's *Literary History of Early Christianity*, vol. ii., p. 514 sq.; Duchesne's *Early History of the Church*, pp. 333-6; Farrar's Bampton Lectures on *The History of Interpretation*, p. 207; Salmon's article in *Dictionary of Christian Biography*.

The Book of Daniel in both its Greek forms contains matter not to be found in the Massoretic text. There are three such passages: (1) Bel and the Dragon; (2) additions to the story of the Three Holy Children; and (3) the story of Susanna, one of the earliest of detective tales. In the early Christian copies of the Septuagint both Bel and Susanna formed an integral part of Daniel, though it is not doubtful that they were adventitious, and were originally no part of the book (see Swete, *Introduction to Old Testament in Greek*, p. 260, 1; R. H. Charles, *Between the Old and New Testaments*, pp. 194 sqq., and Charles' *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, i. 625-651). The Susanna Legend may embody a true tradition, but cannot be regarded as historical (cf. Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, iv. 631). Origen's reply to Africanus offers, says Westcott, a crucial proof of his deficiency in historical criticism, despite his great learning and philosophical attainments.

ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ ΠΡΟΣ ΩΡΙΓΕΝΗΝ

ΧΑΙΡΕ κύριέ μου καὶ υἱέ, καὶ πάντα τιμώτατε Ὡρίγενες, παρὰ Ἀφρικανού.

§ 1. Ὅτε τὸν ἱερὸν ἐποιοῦ πρὸς τὸν Ἀγνώμονα διάλογον, ἐμνήσθης τῆς ἐν νεότητι προφητείας τοῦ Δανιήλ· καὶ ὡς ἔπρεπεν, ἡσπασάμην τότε. θαυμάζω δὲ πῶς ἔλαθέ σε τὸ μέρος τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦτο κίβδηλον ὄν· ἡ γὰρ τοι περικοπὴ αὕτη χαρίεν μὲν ἄλλως σύγγραμμα, νεωτερικὸν δὲ καὶ πεπλασμένον δείκνυται τε καὶ κατὰ πολλοὺς ἀπελέγχεται τρόπους.

§ 2. Τῆς γὰρ Σωσαννης ἀποθανεῖν κεκελευσμένης, πνεύματι ληφθεὶς ὁ προφήτης ἐξεβόησεν ὡς ἀδίκως ἢ ἀπόφασις ἔχοι. πρῶτον οὖν ὅτι Δανιήλ ἄλλῳ τρόπῳ προφητεύει ὁράμασι καὶ ὀνείροις διὰ παντὸς καιροῦ, καὶ ἀγγέλου ἐπιφανείας τυγχάνει, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐπιπνοία προφητικῇ. ἔπειτα μετὰ τὸ θαυμασίως πως οὗτος ἀποφθεγξασθαι· καὶ παραδοξότατά πως αἰτίους ἀπελέγχει, ὡς οὐδὲ ὁ Φιλιστίων ὁ μῖμος. οὐ γὰρ ἐξήρκει ἡ διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπίπληξις, ἀλλ' ἰδίᾳ διαστήσας ἑκάτερον αὐτῶν ἐρωτᾷ πού αὐτὴν θεάσαιτο μοιχωμένην. ὡς δὲ ὁ μὲν ὑπὸ πρίνον ἔφασκεν, ἀποκρίνεται πρίσειν αὐτὸν τὸν ἀγγελον· τῷ δὲ ὑπὸ σχίνον εἰρηκότι, σχισθῆναι παραπλησίως ἀπειλεῖ. ἐν μὲν οὖν Ἑλληνικαῖς φωναῖς τὰ τοιαῦτα ὁμοφωνεῖν συμβαίνει, παρὰ τὴν πρίνον τὸ πρίσαι, καὶ σχίσαι παρὰ τὴν σχίνον· ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἑβραϊδὶ τῷ πάντι διέστηκεν. ἐξ Ἑβραίων δὲ τοῖς Ἑλλησι μετεβλήθη πάνθ' ὅσα τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης φέρεται.

§ 3. Πῶς δὲ, παρὰ Χαλδαίοις αἰχμάλωτοι ὄντες ἐν τῇ Βαβυλῶνι, ἐστραγγαλωμένοι καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἄταφοι ῥιπτούμενοι (ὡς ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ αἰχμαλωσίᾳ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἱστορεῖται), τῶν τε παίδων αὐτοῖς ἀποσπωμένων εἰς εὐνουχισμόν καὶ τῶν θυγατέρων εἰς παλλακὰς (ὡς πεπροφήτευτο),—οἷδ' ἔτι καὶ περὶ θανάτου ἔκρινον; καὶ ταῦτα τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως αὐτῶν γενομένην γυναῖκα Ἰωακείμ, ὃν σύνθρονον πεποίητο ὁ τῶν Βαβυλωνίων βασιλεὺς. εἰ δὲ οὐχ οὗτος ἀλλ' ἄλλος τις τοῦ λαοῦ Ἰωακείμ, πόθεν τοιαύτη κατάλυσις αἰχμαλωτῷ περιῆν, καὶ παράδεισος ἀμφιλαφῆς ἦν;

§ 4. πρὸ δὲ τούτων ἀπάντων ἤδε ἡ περικοπὴ, σὺν ἄλλαις δύο ταῖς ἐπὶ τῷ τέλει, τῷ παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων εἰλημμένῳ Δανιήλ οὐκ ἐμφέρεται. Ἐπὶ δὲ πᾶσι, τοσοῦτων προωδοιπορηκότων προφητῶν ἐξῆς, οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν ἕτερος ἑτέρου κεχρημένος ῥητῷ νοήματι· οὐ γὰρ ἐπτώχευεν ὁ λόγος αὐτῶν ἀληθῆς ὢν. οὐτοσί δὲ, ἐκείνων θατέρῳ ἐπαπειλῶν, ὑπομιμνήσκει λέγοντος τοῦ Κυρίου· ἀθῶον καὶ δίκαιον οὐκ ἀποκτενεῖς. ἐξ ἀπάντων τούτων ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ προσκεῖσθαι ἡ περικοπή, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς φράσεως ὁ χαρακτήρ διαλλάσσει.

§ 5. Ἐκρουσα· σὺ δέ μοι καὶ ἤχησον καὶ ἀντιγράφων παίδευε. τοὺς κυρίους μου πάντας προσαγόρευε· σὲ οἱ ἐπιστάμενοι πάντες προσαγορεύουσιν. ἐρρῶσθαί σε ἅμα τῇ συνοδίᾳ, καὶ κατὰ νοῦν Θεῷ εὐχομαι.

TRANSLATION OF THE LETTER

Greetings, my lord and son, most honoured Origen, from Africanus.

§ 1. When you were having your wonderful discussion with Agnomon, you made mention of the prophecy of Daniel in his youth; and, at that time, as was fitting, I accepted it. But now I am surprised you have overlooked the fact that this section of the book is not genuine. For

I assure you that this section, though on other grounds a pleasing composition, is obviously a recent innovation; and this is shewn by many proofs.

§ 2. When Susanna was condemned to death, the prophet, rapt by the Spirit, cried aloud against the injustice of the sentence. In the first place, then, Daniel always prophesies in a different fashion, namely by dreams and visions; he is faced with an angelic apparition: he never speaks by prophetic inspiration. In the second place, after delivering himself in this marvellous manner, he detects the guilty elders in a surprising way, such as even Philistion the playwright would not have devised. For rebuking them through the Spirit was not enough; he took each apart, privately, and asked them severally where they saw Susanna committing adultery. When the one said, "Under a holm-oak," Daniel replied, "The angel will saw you asunder"; and when the other declared, "Under a mastich tree," Daniel threatened him in like fashion with the words, "You shall be torn in two." It is true that, in Greek, the words have a similar sound—"holm-oak" and "saw asunder"; "mastich" and "tear in two"—but in Hebrew the words are entirely different.* Now all the writings of the Old Testament have been translated from Hebrew into Greek.

§ 2. But how comes it about that captives among the Chaldeans in Babylon, strangled and then flung out, unburied, into the streets (as is related of the earlier captivity of Israel), with their sons dragged from them to become eunuchs and their daughters to become concubines—as had been prophesied,—how, I say, could such men pass a death-sentence? and that, too, on the wife of their King, Joachim, whom the Babylonian monarch had made partner of his throne? And if it was not this Joachim, but some other from the common people of Israel, how did a man like that obtain such a palace and so ample a park?

§ 4. But there is a further difficulty: this section, together with two other sections at the end [of the book], is not included in the DANIEL received as Canonical by the Jews. And, above all, none of the older prophets used the precise phraseology of another; their own words, being true, were unborrowed. But *this* prophet, when rebuking one of the two Elders, quotes the saying of Jehovah: "The innocent and righteous man shalt thou not slay." From these considerations, I hold that this section has been thrust into the text. Furthermore, the style of writing is different.

§ 5. There is my blow! do you give the echo, and teach me with your reply. Salute all my masters. All the learned salute you. With all my heart I pray for a blessing on you and yours.

NOTES ON THE LETTER

ASCRPTION.—Κύριε: respectful form of address (*cf.* *ad fin.*). Frequent in the papyri—*e.g.*, B.G.U. 423 Ἀπίων ἐπιμάχῳ τῷ πατρί καὶ κυρίῳ πλεῖστα χαίρειν. In N.T. Κύριε = "Sir" (vocative)—*e.g.*, Matt. xxvii. 63. Similarly τίμιος is common enough: *P. Oxyrh.* 292 Θέων Τυράννῳ τῷ τιμιωτάτῳ πλ.χ.

§ 1. ἱερόν; not "sacred" here, but rather "admirable" (or even "vigorous," as often in Homer: Leaf on *Iliad*, vol. i.,² appendix D).

Ἀγνώμονα: in his reply to Julius, Origen gives the name as Bassus.

* C. J. Ball's rendering "under a may-tree . . . will dismay you; under a thorn-tree . . . be torn in two" is ingenious.—F. C. BURKITT.

προφητείας: Daniel, moved by the divine spirit within him (**πνεύματι ληφθείς**), interpreted and proclaimed the will of heaven, to secure justice to a much-wronged woman. Cf. Shakespeare (*M. of V.*, IV. i. 223), "A Daniel come to judgement!"

περικοπή = *paragraph*. Often loosely used by Christian writers of a portion of Scripture appointed to be read in church. The word is frequently employed in a quite general sense, as in Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, vii. 886, (we supply what is wanting) **εἰς ἀναπλήρωσιν τῆς περικοπῆς** (=to complete the passage). The section in John viii., on the Woman taken in Adultery, is generally known as the "pericope de adultera."

σύγγραμμα: of any written composition, esp. in prose.

πεπλασμένον: "fabricated" (cf. Plato, *Timaeus*, 26, **μὴ πλασθέντα μῦθον ἀλλ' ἀληθινὸν λόγον**).

§ 2. **Σωσάννης**: cf. Susanna 41.

νεωτερικόν: L. and S. give "youthful," quoting only from Polybius; but here it means "innovating." The word appears in Ignat., *ad. Magn.*, iii (where see Lightfoot).

ἀπόφασις: a legal decision. Cf. *Martyr. Ignat.* (Antiochene Acts) ii.

ἐπιφανείας: the Greeks use this word of some divine manifestation. For the "dreams and visions" see Daniel vii. *sqq.*

ἐπιπνοία προφητικῇ: the Jews did not reckon the canonical book of Daniel as inspired, in the sense in which the Torah is inspired (cf. Driver, *Introd. to Daniel*, § 3.) **ἐπίπνοια** in Plato is the regular word for divine inspiration.

PHILISTION, mentioned by Epiphanius and Jerome; but nothing seems to be known about him except that he was a writer of "mimes."

ἰδία διαστήσας: Susanna 51-9.

πρίνον . . . σχίνον: the play on the words is referred to by Jerome in his preface to Daniel, **σχίνος** = mastich-tree and **σχίσει** = will cleave thee; **πρίνος** = a holm-tree, and the verb **πρίσαι** = to saw thee. "In English we might write: 'Under a clove tree'—'The angel will cleave thee asunder.' 'Under a yew'—'The angel will hew thee asunder'" (C. J. Ball).

§ 3. **ἐστραγγαλωμένοι**: cf. Tobit ii. 3.

προτέρα αἰχμαλωσία: the captivity of the Ten Tribes of Israel (the Northern Kingdom). Samaria fell B.C. 722.

περὶ θ. ἔκρινον: cf. Jerome on Jer. xxix. 22: "unde et a plerisque ac paene omnibus Hebraeis ipsa [historia] quasi fabula non recipiter, nec legitur in synagogis eorum. Qui enim, inquit, fieri poterat ut captivi lapidandi principes et prophetas suos haberent potestatem?" Origen, in his reply to Africanus (§ 14), endeavours to deal with this argument.

JOACHIM—i.e., Jehoiachin. Possibly the King of Judah who was carried captive to Babylon and afterwards set free (2 Kings xxiv., xxv.). But, as Professor F. C. Burkitt reminds me, "Susanna, both in LXX and Theodotion, only speaks of Joachim as a man, very rich, who dwelt in Babylon, and does not identify him with King J."

ὡς πεπροφήτευστο: Jer. xvi. 3, 4; Isa. xxxix. 7.

ὃν πεποίητο: Jer. lii. 32. The plupf. pass.* is here used in a medial sense. The Babylonian King had "adopted" Joachim as co-regent.

* The syllabic augment is dropped. Very common in Hellenistic Greek in the case of the plupf. pass.

§ 4. σὺν ἄλλαις δύο—viz., Bel and the Dragon, and the Song of the Three Holy Children. Though δύο is sometimes (as here) indeclinable, the usual form of the dative in LXX is δυοί(ν).

οὐκ ἐπρώχεν—i.e., they had no need to go begging for words.

ἀθῶον κ.τ.λ. exactly quoted from Exod. xxiii. 7.

προσκειῖσθαι = to be an addition (to the narrative): adscitum fuisse.

φράσεως χαρακτήρ: as in Herod. i. 57 χ. γλώσσης (of a peculiar dialect).

§ 5. ἀντιγράφων: similarly used in Thucyd. i. 129.

ἐρρῶσθαι, "curate ut valeatis." The ordinary formula was ἐρρωσο or εὐτύχει. P. Tebt. papyrus 421 ἐρρῶσθαί σε εὐχομαι; and cf.

Acts xv. 29, 3 John 2; Lightfoot on Ignat., ep. ad Eph. (ad fin.).

Similarly in classical writers—e.g., Xen. Cyrop. iv. 5, 33.

συνοδία: others read συνουσία. Either word means "company," "party." It occurs, once, in New Testament—Luke ii. 44.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

DYOVOUNIOTES AND THE APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION

PROFESSOR K. DYOVOUNIOTES' (Δυοβουνιώτης) address on "The Union of the Anglican Church with the Orthodox and the Validity of Anglican Orders"* was delivered as a Rectorial opening speech at the beginning of the academic year 1931-32 in Athens University. It is divided into two parts;† the first deals with the question whether the union of the churches is possible, while the second is concerned with the possibility of recognizing the ordinations of the churches of the Anglican Communion.

In the first part of the lecture the Professor deals with the Anglican position as to the sufficiency of Scripture and the fallibility of General Councils,‡ with the teaching of the Thirty-nine Articles about Original Sin and Justification by Faith,§ and with what is said in the Prayer-Book, and the Articles about the number of the Sacraments, and about Holy Communion.|| Referring to the present tendency to minimize the binding authority of the Articles, he remarks:¶ "It is clear that once the authority of the Symbolic Books of the Anglican Church has been removed, permission to form their own religious ideas subjectively and arbitrarily is granted to her members, so far as they do not recognize the authority (αυθεντία) of the Church." The Professor concludes that if the Thirty-nine Articles and the Prayer-Book are put aside, the teaching of the Church of England can be fairly judged only by considering the opinions of all her individual members today. That he has not attempted to do. But the dogmatic disagreements between the Anglican Church and Orthodoxy to which he has referred in his short review of part of the teaching of the Anglican Formularies (assuming their authority), and other like dogmatic disagreements, must be removed before there can be any question of reunion. Without dogmatic agreement union could not be real or permanent. It should also be understood that intercommunion without previous union is out of the question. "The Eastern

* Λόγος περὶ τῆς ἐνώσεως τῆς Ἀγγλικανικῆς ἐκκλησίας μετὰ τῆς ὀρθοδόξου καὶ (περὶ) τοῦ κύρους τῶν Ἀγγλικανικῶν χειροτονιῶν, ὑπὸ Κ. Δυοβουνιώτου, Athens, 1932.

† Pp. 1-16, 17-26.

|| Pp. 9-14.

‡ Pp. 5-8.

¶ Pp. 15-16.

§ Pp. 8-9.

Church never has allowed and never will allow her members to receive the Sacraments and the grace of the Holy Spirit from the clerics of a heterodox church. He who thinks otherwise is certainly no Orthodox Christian."

In the second and more important part of the Professor's speech the question in hand is exclusively the manner of receiving into the Orthodox Church Anglicans who leave their present position and wish to become Orthodox. The question of "reordination" arises only in connexion with those who have been ordained by heterodox or schismatic bishops, and afterwards wish to join the Church. The Orthodox Church of the East has never authoritatively solved the question of principle. But undoubtedly the prevailing opinion, following SS. Cyprian and Firmilian, has been in favour of the ordination within the Church of all who are to minister in the Church. However, in some instances in practice, economy has been applied since the fifth century—that is to say, the principles of the Church have not been applied in all their strictness to some particular instances. Among the clerics who have entered the Orthodox Church from one heterodox body it is a fact that some have been baptized and ordained in the Orthodox Church, on their reception, and others have been allowed to go on ministering as clerics in the Orthodox Church without reordination. "Most of our people," remarks Dyovouniotes, "think that the conditions of the applicability of economy reside in the former confession of faith of the heretics and schismatics coming into the Church and the regularity of their former execution of the Sacraments, particularly baptism and ordination." But this is a mistake. "The Church takes those facts into consideration, but the condition (or test) of the application of economy is the salvation of souls." The Church, in providing for the spiritual interests of many, makes use of economy for the avoidance of their spiritual damage and for their greater spiritual benefit in comparison with the results of applying Church principles strictly. There are theologians who consider, according to the Western theory, that sacraments regularly celebrated by heretics convey to their recipients the type or outward part, and believe that the recipients of heretical sacraments receive the grace of those sacraments on coming into the Church. "It is, however, clear that on this view the sacraments of heretics are recognized absolutely, not merely recognized by economy."* The possibility of the strict application of Church principles in reordination and rebaptism must not be overlooked. The Professor's conclusion is that the Eastern Church does not recognize among heretics any apostolic succession.† Economy applied to the sacraments changes the invalid into the valid, and the valid into the invalid.‡ The Orthodox Church "can, by economy, recognize the sacraments (i.e., the Baptism and Ordination) of Anglicans coming forth" into her.§

In *Pantaios* last February the last conclusions were reaffirmed, and in the *Church Quarterly Review* last March some of the arguments of the

* P. 23, footnote.

† "The discussion about economy, with the Lambeth Conference, and the Bishop of Gloucester's question were directed, it seems to me, towards such a recognition by economy on the part of the Eastern Church of Anglican priesthood that Anglican sacraments in general should be confirmed. But the Eastern Church . . . never recognized the sacraments celebrated outside her, but only used economy in relation to those coming forth into her" (p. 24, footnote).

‡ P. 21.

§ P. 24.

later part of the lecture were repeated in English by Dyovouniotes, but nowhere does he allude to the idea of admitting clerics not episcopally ordained into an episcopal church without ordination.* He seems to refuse to refer to that, for in *Pantainos* in November, 1932, the Metropolitan Germanos asked him to re-explain his known opinions in relation to the "exploitation" of them by supporters of the South Indian Reunion Scheme; but in his re-explanations he made no reference to any non-episcopal body.

The lecture concludes unfavourably to the idea of any official reunion negotiations for the present, but "it does not follow that all work in the direction of union, and particularly the friendly relations of the two Churches, ought to stop." Dyovouniotes believes that there is a Greek Christian spirit in the Church of England associated with classical Greek education and with the memory of links with the East in the earliest period of English Church History. This spirit, still energetic in the Church of England, shews itself in esteem and love for the ancient Church and courageous opposition to the antichristian tendencies of Western Christendom. In spite of the differences between the two Churches, that spirit links them together, and an Orthodox theologian can come to a common understanding and conduct a discussion more fruitfully with an Anglican than with a Roman Catholic. That is Dyovouniotes' solution of the apparently very natural question put by many Roman Catholics who cannot understand "why the Easterners shew more sympathy for the Anglican Church than for the Western Church, with whom, without doubt, they have much smaller differences than the Anglican Church has."

In the *Church Quarterly Review* last September there was an article by Professor George Florovsky of Paris, giving another point of view on the subject of sacraments performed outside the Orthodox Church, and contending that when they are not repeated on converts coming to

* For instance, in a letter to the Metropolitan of India (*Church Times*, August 26, 1932) the work of Dyovouniotes under review was quoted by a group of English bishops and divines. Notwithstanding the Professor's silence, in fact all the more because of his silence, as to non-episcopal bodies, I cannot help thinking that the principle he professes does leave room for the possibility of admitting into Orthodoxy without ordination a cleric from a church in which the "tactual" succession of bishops had been broken, supposing, of course, that the cleric had come to Orthodox dogmatic soundness about every matter of faith, including the necessity, in principle, of the Apostolic Succession. That is the difficulty in the whole conception fastened on to the varieties of Orthodox practice by the Professor. It has to be supposed that converts admitted to the Orthodox Church without ordination acknowledge, in so far as they have received proper theological instruction and testing, that their ordinations and also their baptisms, received outside Orthodoxy, were of themselves invalid, and need miraculous economic transformation into valid sacraments. If the converts admit that much, what valid reason has any one for objecting to their being always reordained, and is not that always the safer course? The fact is, of course, that they do not admit it unreservedly, and what they think happened at their reception into the Church differs from what really happened according to Dyovouniotes' opinion. We arrive at dissimulation as the translation of economy, and that is the regrettable thing about the whole conception. Fr. Florovsky develops that attack upon it in what he says about the opinions of the Metropolitan Antony of Kieff. An extreme rigidity is tempered by the admission that it means that many simple Christians can never accept a fully correct doctrinal position. This is rather like saying that because, strictly speaking, second marriage is only a decent adultery, the Church that can recognize second marriage by economy can go further and marry divorced people by economy. *Non tali auxilio*. We cannot thus defend our approaches to the Protestants, which are based on an entirely different line of thought.

Orthodoxy the Orthodox Church means to recognize them as real sacraments conveying grace to people who are thereby in a sense members of the Orthodox Church, though outside her "canonical frontiers." There is an able criticism of the type of position exemplified by Dyovouniotes' lecture.

EDWARD EVERY.

HALKI, CONSTANTINOPLE,
January 4, 1934.

PRAYERS FOR THE KING IN THE FIRST CENTURY

It seems to be generally agreed that the Prayers for the King have had their day in the ordinary parish church. The King occupies so important a place in the Prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church that the specific prayers can be omitted without any suspicion of disloyalty. In particular, to many minds, the sixteenth-century phraseology is distasteful. (The two Memorials in the Communion Service date from 1549, and the prayer in Mattins and Evensong in its earliest form appeared in 1545.)

Now let us see how the Christians at Rome prayed for Domitian at the end of the first century. We learn this from the liturgical prayer at the end of the Epistle of Clement, the secretary-bishop, written in the name of the Church of Rome to the Corinthian Church. In the earliest days of the Church, according to the *Didache*, the prophets "gave thanks" as they willed. For others a set form was prescribed. We may suppose that, as in Free Church worship today, free prayer soon assumed a stereotyped form. Clement is probably repeating the phrases which he himself used in the Eucharist and which he rightly feels will be helpful to others.

We are struck by the extraordinary prominence given to "the State Prayers." The Christians inherited from the synagogue the practice of praying for the Emperor, and, just because any form of participation in the imperial cult was impossible for them, they threw themselves with the more fervour into prayer for the Emperor. The Roman Christians, especially, would feel a thrill as they contemplated the greatness of the realm centred in their city. They inherited the tradition of St. Paul, who said with pride, "I am a free born citizen," and they cherished his teaching—"he is the minister of God to thee for good" (Rom. xiii. 4).

The relevant part of the prayer is as follows. In brackets the corresponding parts of the English prayers for the King are added; it may be assumed that they are so familiar to the reader that the exact source need not be given. Clement's words have been rendered into Prayerbook English wherever possible.

"[lix. 4] Give unanimity and peace to us and all the dwellers upon earth (*behold all the dwellers upon earth*) . . . that we may be saved, becoming subjects (*we and all his subjects*) to Thy almighty and excellent name, and to our princes and governors upon earth (*all Christian Kings, Princes, and Governors*). [lx.] Thou, Lord, hast given the authority of the kingdom to them by Thy majestic and unutterable power, that we, knowing the glory and honour given to them by Thee, may obey them (*whose kingdom is everlasting—knowing whose minister he is—power infinite—knowing whose minister he is—honour and glory—we . . . may humbly obey him*), in no way opposing Thy will (*incline to Thy will*). To whom,

O Lord, grant health, peace, unanimity, wealth* (*health and wealth long to live*), that they may exercise the rule given them by Thee without offence (*people committed to his charge*). For Thou, heavenly Lord, King of the ages (*heavenly Father, King of kings, Lord of lords*), givest to the sons of men honour and glory and authority (*thy honour and glory*) over what is on the earth. Do Thou, Lord, direct their will (*rule the heart*) as it seems good and well pleasing before Thee (*as it seemeth best to Thy godly wisdom*), that, exercising in peace and gentleness and godly fashion the authority given them by Thee (*godly and quietly governed*), that may attain thy mercy (*attain everlasting joy and felicity*)."

So, of our Prayer for the King, which seemed so Tudor, it may be said:†

"It was so old a *prayer*—who knows, who knows?

—And yet so beautiful. . . .

And, wonder's breath indrawn,

Thought I—who knows—who knows—but in that same"—

phrasing St. Peter and St. Paul under sentence of martyrdom taught the Roman Christians to pray for Nero! The *editio princeps* of Clement was published in 1633. Clearly, then, the Reformers did not borrow from Clement. Rather did his phraseology so become the common heritage of the Church that fourteen centuries later prayer writers naturally employed it. If it has done nothing else, our note has taught us to be very careful in deducing literary borrowings from similarity of language.

W. K. L. C.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Jewish Quarterly Review. Vol. xxv., No. 1.

Professor Louis Finkelstein contributes a useful review of Dr. Max Kadushin's *The Theology of Seder Eliahu*, in which he points out that the abundant anthropomorphisms of rabbinic works concern the activities of God and not His essence (*cf. Maimonides' Guide for the Perplexed*, Friedländer's translation, pp. 60-63).

Professor Solomon Zeitlin, in reviewing several recent contributions to the study of Judaism and Christianity, calls attention to the recently completed edition of Josephus issued by the Société des Études Juives, the first volume of which appeared as far back as 1900.

D. S. Blondheim tells us that in 1930 not only the Société des Études Juives, an organization devoted to the study of Jewish learning, kept its fiftieth anniversary, but that the École Rabbinique in Paris celebrated its centenary. This institution exists for the training of Rabbis, and has given to the world of learning many well-known scholars. Its centenary volume *L'École Rabbinique de France (1830-1930)* tells how the Government troops in 1871 used the Seminary as an outpost, firing upon the Communists from behind piles of volumes of the Talmud.

Professor Bernhard Heller concludes his review of Louis Ginzberg's *Legends of the Jews*. His five papers have given us a valuable commentary on and introduction to this work of vast learning.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

* εὐστράθειαν, prosperity of mind and body.

† If J. E. Flecker's verses may be thus adapted.

REVIEW

THE PERSON OF CHRIST. By L. W. Grensted, D.D. Nisbet and Co. 10s. 6d.

Men preparing for the ministry are sometimes distressed to find that their studies have diminished their capacity to pray and to worship. Biblical criticism has brought disillusionment about many cherished beliefs; Church history has revealed the unexpected earthiness of the agency which is entrusted with the establishment of the Kingdom; and, above all, the technicalities of dogmatic theology have substituted for the spirit of devotion a barren intellectualism and an unprofitable cleverness in the presence of One who seemed to be far better known before the attempt was made to understand Him. When this serious position has been reached and declared, it is usual for someone to recommend the reading of certain books of devotion, and the careful revision of the devotional time-table, and to speak sympathetically of the need of maintaining a due balance between the devotional and the intellectual life; with the result that, in some cases at least, the head and the heart are never able to find true peace together, each keeping an anxious and suspicious watch upon the other.

What is needed in such a time of crisis is the help of a devout scholar, a theologian who both knows and worships, a disciple who loves God with all his mind, a teacher who preaches and a preacher who teaches—in short, the kind of help that is provided in Dr. Grensted's admirable book on *The Person of Christ*. I observe that some of those who reviewed the book with the promptitude to which its importance entitled it—and here I apologize for the lateness of this notice—have reported that they found the book a searching sermon rather than a technical treatise on Christological problems. That, as I understand the editors of the Library of Constructive Theology and the author of this particular volume, is precisely what it was intended to be; and that is the reason why it is proving to have a very special usefulness. The distinction between preaching and teaching is pressed far too hard, in my opinion, though it is, of course, true that the technique of the sermon and of the lecture is different. Our sermons ought to provide more teaching; and the lectures of Christian teachers ought not to lack the note of conviction and that direct appeal which inevitably accompanies the convinced statement of a man who speaks because he cares greatly for the truth he teaches. Dr. Grensted's book is not a course of lectures on the Person of

Christ; and it would not suffice, it was not intended to suffice, for the preparation of a student who was taking an examination on the subject. As the writer says, there are many excellent books already available for that purpose. But here is a book written by a man who is well versed in the learning contained in those other books, and able to use it with the ability of a practised scholar, but a book also which is a personal testimony of loyal devotion to Christ and a record of vital Christian experience shared in the Body of Christ.

It is, to my mind, particularly striking for its restraint and humility in its use of psychological learning. No man capable of writing such a book has a better right than Dr. Grensted to parade such learning; and there are those who would welcome it in the belief that it ought to have much to say in the interpretation of the consciousness of Christ and of the experience of His followers. But Dr. Grensted knows too much, and is of too reverent a nature, to presume to declare things which a man with less understanding might make bold to explain.

If I am to criticize at all a book which I desire only to commend, it must be in respect of one general and important matter and one particular and comparatively small thing. The larger matter is that of the sum total of the Christian experience which falls to be examined in this book. It is obvious that our ability to share, sympathetically, the experience of the various types of Christian disciples is limited. But I could have wished to find in this book, so that it might be yet more useful, a greater attention to the saints and ascetics and mystics of the Church, with their marked devotion to the Crucified and Risen Lord and their progressive assimilation to Him in various ways; and I think that there is much more to be said about the sacramental fellowship that is so greatly valued by Catholics, and especially about those experiences which are associated with Eucharistic devotion.

The smaller matter has to do with the reference to the use of the Litany on p. 60. My own experience is the exact opposite of Dr. Grensted's, and I am convinced that he is mistaken in supposing that "in those churches where it is desired to hold the interest and to lead the devotion of a modern congregation, the Litany, as it stands, must go." Perhaps, on consideration, he would not stand by this dictum, for on p. 161 he is found regretting our readiness to "change the God of love and holiness, who may not endure our sin, into a God of sentimental benevolence who gives us only too easily the reassurance for which we crave."

OSCAR HARDMAN.

NOTICES

INTRODUCTION TO GREEN'S MORAL PHILOSOPHY. By W. D. Lamont, D.Phil. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

Some characteristics of Green's *Prolegomena to Ethics* make an abridged edition well-nigh impossible. Dr. Lamont has, however, done something better: he has produced within reasonable compass an independent exposition or interpretative paraphrase. He has done this difficult piece of work with remarkable impartiality and balance, reserving an indication of his own positions to an Appendix of critical and explanatory notes. His own views do not coincide in all respects with those of Green. He contends that theistic and pantheistic ideas struggle together in Green's mind and that the conception of reality which Green propounds leads logically to extreme Absolutism.

Undergraduates who find Green included amongst prescribed texts for Intermediate and Honours classes in philosophy will find this introduction useful—all the more so on account of its system of references to the paragraphs of the *Prolegomena*. It will, also, enable the general reader to appreciate this outstanding contribution of "Idealism" to ethical study.

Green's work possesses a quality which gives it a disciplinary value for students of philosophy quite apart from its theoretic content: his work belongs to the great tradition, among those who (in Bosanquet's words) "put the central things in the centre and take as their standard what man recognizes as value when his life is fullest and his soul at its highest stretch."

F. W. BUTLER.

THE JOHANNINE DOCTRINE OF LIFE. By A. J. Appasamy, D.Phil. S.P.C.K. 5s.

Not since the appearance of P. C. Mozumdar's *Oriental Christ* have we had a book which may be compared with this. There are, it is true, wide differences between the two works. The one was essentially an estimate of the character and teaching of the historic Jesus by a writer who never formally entered the Christian Church. The other we owe to a pronounced and consecrated Christian mind, and it is a meditation on the meaning of Christ in the experience of men. It is not to be classed as exegesis, or even as theology; it rather belongs to the literature of devotion.

Dr. Appasamy has given us an altogether lovely combination of scholarship and mysticism. The reader who expects from the title anything like a commentary on the Fourth Gospel will be disappointed, until he realizes that he has something very much better. The writer has penetrated to the heart of Johannine thought, and his quotations (occasionally taken also from Synoptic sources) are used to illustrate those aspects of the inner life on which the author fastens. We feel that we have here the very spirit that informed and inspired the Gospel of St. John.

Biblical quotations, however, are less prominent than passages taken from Hindu saints and mystics. The primary aim of the book would seem to be the presentation of Christian experience in a form which will appeal to a reader trained in the higher Hinduism. We have, therefore, a sympathetic appreciation of the deepest and noblest Indian thought.

A double tendency is manifest throughout the book. On the one hand we have the emphasis on those features in which the two religions resemble one another, and on the other hand we have the contrast drawn between them. Christianity and Hinduism both seek to meet the deepest needs of the human spirit, and to all appearance their vocabulary has something in common. But the appearance is often misleading. Ordinary Christian language has nothing to express that mingling of faith and love suggested by *Bhakti*—the Hebrew *hesed* is, perhaps, nearer to it than any Greek or English term. "Peace" and *Santi* are by no means synonymous, and, though we may render *Moksha* by "liberation," the appendix which Dr. Appasamy devotes to this word shews how far the West is from appreciating its fulness.

While, then, both Hinduism and Christianity endeavour to solve the urgent problems of the spirit on mystical lines, there is a great gulf between the two. That is one of the strongest impressions we gain from the book. Especially important is the insistence on the metaphysical and ethical preparation for Christianity supplied by Greek (and may we not add Hebrew?) thought. Hindu philosophy could not possibly have formed a basis for Christian teaching. Up to a point the two faiths may move along the same line, but there they diverge, and no reconciliation between them can be valid. In its complete repudiation of anything resembling a pantheistic interpretation of God, man, and the world, the Gospel of Jesus Christ offers an emphatic protest against that denial of personality as an ultimate mode of reality which is the inevitable foundation of all true Hindu thinking. Dr. Appasamy more than once quotes from Indian writers (especially the more modern) who seek to deny or to escape from Pantheism and all its implications, but the resultant failure of all such efforts serves only to emphasize the real character of Hinduism. We are left with the impression that this book is the work of a man who understands, through and through, the Indian soul and its needs, and would say of the Christ whom he knows, "There is no other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved."

T. H. ROBINSON.

MIXED PASTURE. By Evelyn Underhill. Methuen. 5s.

A *réchauffé* of papers written over a long period of years for particular audiences and purposes seldom makes a good book. Miss Underhill knows this and has forestalled criticism by her choice of a title with an explanatory quotation from von Hügel. If these Essays and Addresses are somewhat slight, yet she has something to say in almost all of them that is worth the hearing, and we may be grateful to her for this collection and browse therein with profit.

The first group of papers on the Philosophy of Contemplation, Sanctity and Spiritual Life cover ground already familiar, and if the author does not add much to what she has already written on these subjects she at least emphasizes it.

The second group is very good. In the first three papers Miss Underhill is concerned with what she calls "the carrying through of the *implicit*s of spiritual world into every detail of the common life." Whatever one may think of the suitability of the word italicized, no doubt is possible as to the importance of the subject, and the author's treatment of it is both

wise and stimulating. She has some strong things to say about the selfishly mystical and the "professionally pious" and recalls them to their corporate responsibilities. We congratulate her on her use of telling phrases, but while we entirely sympathize with her strictures on the type of religiosity she designates by the term "piety," we greatly regret that an essentially good word should be confined to its worst meaning. We are glad to see in this collection the excellent paper on "The Ideals of the Ministry of Women" which has already appeared in THEOLOGY.

The third section is rather desultory, though the paper on von Hügel is of real interest, combining as it does a knowledge of the man with that of his works. It may, perhaps, be worth noting in passing that Miss Deanesley and Miss Allen are not the *only* scholars who have contributed to our genuine knowledge of Rolle.

F. P. HARTON.

THE LIFE AND TEACHING OF JESUS CHRIST. By C. E. Raven and Eleanor Raven. Cambridge University Press. 4s. 6d.

The authors explain that their purpose is "to give in condensed and simple form the necessary information as to the religious and social situation in Palestine, as to the evidence for the history of Jesus, and as to His life and teaching; and then to introduce the reader to the chief sources of our knowledge of Him." The book, therefore, begins with an outline of Jewish history and religion. In this section we find scant sympathy with the "Religion of Torah," and the prophet is set against the priest in a way which does less than justice to the latter. Jesus Himself shewed no hostility to the Jewish priests, but rather supported their work by word and example. He would, we think, not have agreed that the Temple "was no longer the centre of vital religion" (p. 17). Even the early Christians could hardly shake themselves free from its glamour and power. Chapter II. briefly describes the sources of our evidence for Christ's life and teaching. All three Synoptic Gospels are put before A.D. 70. On the ground that St. Luke probably gathered his material while at Cæsarea, St. Mark's Gospel is tentatively put earlier than A.D. 58. This may be so, but no account is taken here or elsewhere of the possibility of a Proto-Luke. In dating St. Luke's Gospel before A.D. 70 no mention is made of Luke xxi. 20. The first Gospel is put before A.D. 70 because this best explains the writer's failure to use the Fall of Jerusalem as an argument against the Jews.

In Chapter III. the Markan outline of the Ministry is followed, with an attempt to dovetail some of the Fourth Gospel into the early period, and in Chapter IV. the Teaching of Jesus is fitted neatly into this outline. As regards the miracles, it is insisted that Jesus must not be measured by ordinary standards: "He possessed what we have never known, the influence of a manhood wholly at one with God" (p. 61). Still, the possibility is admitted that what our Lord stilled on the Lake was not the wind and waves, but the disciples' panic; Jairus' daughter was probably not dead; the five loaves and two fishes may have been supplemented by the contents of the usual travelling-baskets. The walking on the sea, however, and the raising of the widow's son and of Lazarus, appear to be accepted, though without discussion. It is noted that all the records agree that the stone was found rolled from the tomb, but the testimony that the tomb was empty is not mentioned, though of course the fact of

the Resurrection is insisted upon. In the description of our Lord's teaching at least one sentence deserves to be quoted: "Jesus does not argue men into belief, nor sway them by emotion, nor exhort them in the manner of the moralist: He flings down phrases that illuminate like flashes of lightning; and sometimes the blind receive sight" (p. 87).

In the last part of the book, St. Mark's Gospel is printed in full, with useful cross-headings; then "Q"; then matter peculiar to St. Luke (including the Birth and Infancy narratives); then some of the matter peculiar to the First and Fourth Gospels. It is not explained why the Birth and Infancy narratives of the First Gospel are omitted, and the selection of material from the Fourth Gospel seems very arbitrary. The book should prove useful, but we think it should either have been more thorough or else should have been given a more modest title.

A. E. MORRIS.

HOSANNA. A novel. Bertram Newman. Denis Archer. 7s. 6d.

Granting to Mr. Bertram Newman his great "If," his speculations as to what might have happened in the life of Christ are as good as anyone's, and any discussion of the matter must end where it began. We remember reading essays on what would have happened if Napoleon had won the battle of Waterloo, and listening to discussions of what would have been the fate of the world if Germany had won the war. All such speculations must end in the air with no other foundation but the original "If." When all is said and done we only know what did happen.

The publishers advertise this novel as the most controversial of the times. But it is hard to reach such a conclusion, seeing that it is based on so very little fact. It is not easy to detect what is the point of controversy, unless it is the point that the Christ did not rise from the grave, an event we should expect if the rest of the story had any foundation in fact.

The most striking thing, perhaps, is the Addendum, purporting to be an account of Jesus, an obscure prophet, taken from the *Encyclopædia Britannica* at this time. By the inversion of History it measures the enormous influence of Christianity on the world. Instead of Christ we have Mahomet as the dominating force in the world. B.C. and A.D. are unknown, the world's history is dated from the founding of Rome, or from the Hejira. All things indeed are new. It is a point well made and we are grateful for it. Mr. Bertram Newman brings to his work a vivid imagination, a graphic pen. The characters live, and the realism of the frightfulness in the taking of Jerusalem by Tiberias and the madness of the Zealots is appalling. The character of Mary Magdalene as a secret service agent is quite up to the standard of a modern thriller. She gives an opportunity for sex appeal, of which the most is made.

If this book has any religious value it is to prove the good that the Christian faith has done to the world. Perhaps this is, after all, the author's purpose.

W. E. LUTYENS.

THE INEVITABLE CROSS. By W. E. Orchard, D.D. Putnam. 7s. 6d.

This book represents the thought of a quarter of a century on the central mystery of Christianity. Dr. Orchard has read and pondered everything available on the doctrine of the Atonement and found, as he says, "Catholic Theology the only safe guide." Consequently this work

is a really learned exposition of the Catholic doctrine of the Cross, all the more interesting since nearly all of it was written before he made his submission to the Holy See. But it is more than this, for the author's teaching has passed through the crucible of his own very vigorous mind and emerged in a shape which takes serious account of contemporary difficulties.

Dr. Orchard addresses his book "first of all to my brethren in the Protestant ministry, many of whom I knew to be in perplexity on this subject; secondly, to that large number of would-be believing people I had come in contact with who found the doctrine of the Atonement full of difficulties; and finally to try to persuade, if not the man in the street, yet the man who reads the newspapers, that the central doctrine of Christianity raises no objections that can be validly urged by an emancipated reason or an enlightened conscience." To these classes of men and to many others this devout and stimulating exposition should be of very great value, and we have certainly not seen any book written on the subject for non-scholars which gives them what Dr. Orchard gives here. This is no dry treatise or argumentative apologetic; the author wears his learning lightly and writes with sincerity and conviction. Many Christian, and even Catholic, teachers today quietly ignore the necessity of the Cross. This should bring us back to a juster and more fruitful theology.

F. P. HARTON.

THEONAS: CONVERSATIONS OF A SAGE. By Jacques Maritain. Translated by F. J. Sheed. Sheed and Ward. 6s.

Maritain is well known as an exponent of revived Thomism, and several of his books have already been translated into English. The essays in the present volume were originally written some twelve years ago, and, with one important exception, they do not make any serious addition to what one already knows to be characteristic of the author and his school of thought. They are couched in dialogue form, and are presumably intended to be an introduction to that way of thinking designed to attract those who are unfamiliar with it. This being so, it is unfortunate that the translator uses an English style which gives the impression of being aridly technical even when it is not so, and in places assumes a familiarity with technical language, as in the statement on p. 38 that Christian contemplation "does not stop short in the intellect as in its term." Two pages later there is a reference to Comte being "stricken with mental alienation"!

The exception referred to above is the long essay in the middle of the book on "The Mathematical Attenuation of Time." This is a criticism of certain philosophical speculations which claim to be founded on the work of Einstein. The criticism is developed through a positive statement of the scholastic teaching on time which is set in contrast with positions that claim to supersede it. Here again there is nothing essentially new in the content of the teaching; but the clear presentation of it in contrast with the "relativist" theories enables one to grasp clearly the principles at issue, and this essay by itself is enough to justify the addition of this volume to the published translations of Maritain's works.

Three other passages remain in the reader's memory. One is the eloquent exposition of the relation of the Church to the world on p. 113.

The Church is the unique society "animated by an omnipotent 'form,' " unique in that in it alone there is an exception to the law that "there follows decrepitude after growth." Yet the Church "is not a foreign body isolated in the midst of humanity, but on the contrary the divinely formed organism into which the human race is called to enter that it may share in the Divine life." Then there is a passage on pp. 144, 145 which rings with a Barthian note: "We do not think enough of the terrible march of the justice of God through human history"—a note which recurs in a further passage about the relation of the world to the Church ten pages later.

In view of such passages as these, and the slighting reference to Luther on p. 20, one wonders whether there may not have been some substance in Professor Wobbermin's recent accusation of Barth that his teaching was responsible for the defection of two of his followers to Rome.

L. HODGSON.

ENQUIRIES INTO RELIGION AND CULTURE. By Christopher Dawson.
Sheed and Ward. 8s. 6d.

This book is a collection of fifteen essays of varying length, written during the last fifteen years. The first four are a description of the present crisis in civilization. The next five give an interpretative analysis of the history of mankind, in which it is exhibited as the history of four great spiritual traditions, European, Islamic, Indian and Chinese, each inspiring a culture in which civilizations rise and fall according to a rhythmic "law" of recurring cycles. The last six essays present the claim of Christianity to provide intellectually the true interpretation of human life and history, and practically the only satisfactory solution of the problems they present.

In these last essays the author shews a tendency to confine the hope of the world somewhat narrowly to Christianity as embodied in Catholicism, and to undervalue the contribution which the Reformation and Protestantism have to make to redeemed humanity in its final consummation. Apart from this there is little that can be criticized in a brief review. No book could cover so wide and varied a field without raising points which the reader would like to discuss, and inevitably the fact that he was writing essays for magazine publication has often driven Mr. Dawson to state his conclusions without being able to give the evidence and arguments which have led to them. One has to be content with the fact that the way in which he states his conclusions shews them to be the result of wide knowledge, deep thought and sound judgment. This is a book which deserves to have a large circulation, and which one would like to see have a strong influence on contemporary thought.

Of especial interest and value are the essays on "St. Augustine and his Age" and on "Christianity and Sex."

L. HODGSON.

A MEMOIR OF THE LIFE AND WORK OF HANNAH COOME. Oxford
University Press. 12s. 6d.

This book describes the struggle of the Catholic way of life and worship to establish itself in Canada in the latter half of the last century, and its triumph in the founding of the first Religious Community for women,

the Sisterhood of St. John the Divine, Toronto. Perhaps it is also the Catholic conception of personality which explains the somewhat misleading title, for this is not merely the story of the life of Mother Hannah, but rather a history of the Community of which she was the Foundress. From the opening in 1885 of "the smallest Convent, perhaps, ever known," the Community has gradually enlarged its spheres of activity in the parish, the hospital, and the school.

There is a mass of detail which has no great interest for the ordinary reader, but the book is written primarily, as the Preface says, "for future generations of Sisters, Associates, and friends." To all alike it will tell of a glorious conquest won over fear and prejudice by the living power of Christian faith.

A. DE SAUSMAREZ.

A HANDBOOK OF HEBREW HISTORY. By J. Hartley Fuidge. Gill. 2s.

This little book deals with the religious, social and political history of Israel from the death of David to 722 B.C., and is meant to assist preparation for the Oxford and Cambridge Local Examinations. If used as the author intends—viz., as a *Handbook*, and not as a substitute for the study of the text—it should fulfil its purpose. One admirable feature is that the relevant parts of the Prophets are annotated along with the Historical Books. The notes are terse, but give the essential points, and they should greatly lighten the teacher's work. Maps, plans, and illustrations increase the interest of the book.

A. E. MORRIS.

THE INTERCESSION OF OUR LORD. By J. B. Bernardin. Columbia University Press (Oxford University Press). 11s.

A scholarly thesis such as this, gathering up the available evidence, on a subject little studied, deserves a warm welcome. The great departed ones were held by the Jews to intercede for those on earth. In Philo the Logos "is a continual suppliant on behalf of the sick-at-heart human race to the Incorruptible One." The angels, too, plead for men, but there seems to be no attribution of this function to the Messiah.

Two sayings of Jesus contain the germ of the doctrine: "Everyone who shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father which is in heaven"; and "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." St. Paul in Rom. viii. 34 speaks of "Christ Jesus . . . who maketh intercession for us." Clearly the Jewish ideas mentioned above have been transferred to Christ. The writer to the Hebrews thinks in terms of priesthood and atonement and makes Christ the intercessor for men along these lines. All this, and a great deal more from the early Fathers, is very happily expounded. The conclusion is "that the doctrine of the heavenly intercession of our Lord in Christian theology is a needless one, and that it has faded into the background deservedly." To imagine that there is any need for the Son's intercession is "to reduce metaphysics to the pious imaginings of a credulous child. The doctrine has had its usefulness in its own day." Such a conclusion, which is presumably true of the circles best known to the author, is a salutary reminder of the difference between Anglicanism and popular Protestantism. Few indeed of our people would be willing thus to scrap the plain teaching of the New Testament.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

DER PROPHET DER HEIMKEHR (JESAJA 40-66). Herausgegeben von Pastor D.Theol. Ludvig Glahn. Vol. I. Die Einheit von Kap. 40-66 des Buches Jesaja. Und D.Theol. H.C., D.Phil. Ludwig Köhler. Vol. II. Das Buch Jesaja Kap. 56-66, textkritisch und metrisch behandelt. Levin und Munksgaard, Kopenhagen, and Alfred Töpelmann, Giessen.

This volume is a happy combination of the work of a Swiss scholar with that of a Dane. The former has given an analysis of the text of Isaiah lv.-lxvi., dividing it into its original short sections, arranging the text metrically, amending it where necessary, and adding to each passage a German translation and textual notes. This forms a useful piece of scholarly work, though, naturally, there are many details on which there is room for difference of opinion.

Dr. Glahn, using Professor Köhler's text as a basis for the study of Isaiah lv.-lxvi., goes back to the position best represented in this country by Sir J. A. Smith, and argues that the whole of Isaiah xl.-lxvi. is to be attributed to a single prophet whose activity is to be dated not later than 530 B.C. While this is far from being the usual view, the author makes out a good case, especially when he urges that portions of chapters lv.-lxvi. assume that the Temple has not yet been rebuilt. Whether his conclusions are accepted or not, Dr. Köhler has re-opened the question in an interesting and scholarly fashion.

T. H. ROBINSON.

LES SULPICIENS. By Jean Monral. B. Grasset. 15 fr.

This book is one of a series on *Les Grands Ordres Monastiques et Instituts Religieux*.

Most people connect St. Sulpice with a particular method of imparting religious instruction to children, but the name Sulpician stands also for a religious Order, which has during nearly three centuries been celebrated for its labours in training men for the priesthood in Europe, America, and latterly China.

In 1641 M. Olier, a disciple of St. Vincent de Paul, struck by the general lack of provision for training ordination candidates, founded an Order to carry out this work. The principal energies of the Order have always been directed to this end, but shortly after its formation M. Olier became Curé of St. Sulpice, then a parish of 150,000 inhabitants. It is from the parish that the Order took its name. Members of the Order are priests, but take no vows and wear no distinctive dress other than that of priests. They exist for the service of the clergy. " 'Nous sommes les prêtres du clergé,' disent-ils 'au service des prêtres, pour les éclairer, les former, les diriger.' "

The Order is divided into three Provinces—France, the United States and China. The usual course of seminary training lasts for six years—from eighteen to twenty-four. One notes with interest that "La douceur est une vertu traditionnelle à Saint-Sulpice." It has certainly been the outstanding quality of those French priests whom the reviewer has met casually in France.

The connection with the parish still continues, as do the famous Catechisms, twelve of them being worked on Sundays and Thursdays by twelve priests and sixty seminarists.

C. P. S. CLARKE.

THE FLAME OF PRAYER. By Edward D. Sedding, S.S.J.E. Mowbray and Co. 3s. 6d.

COLLOQUIES AND PRAYERS FOR HOLY COMMUNION. From the writings of R. M. Benson. Compiled by G. T. Pulley, S.S.J.E. Mowbray and Co. 2s. 6d.

FIRST DAYS IN THE MINISTRY. By Ivor S. Watkins. S.P.C.K. 1s.

THE RELIGIOUS LIFE. Edited by Arnold Pinchard. S.P.C.K. 1s.

It is a curious thing that while we speak of the Purgative, Illuminative or Unitive Ways; though they are but stages on one way: the religious and the priestly life, which are among possible ways to the necessary end, we commonly call *States*, as though to have reached them was to have arrived. Two of these four little books are concerned with these two States of perfection, though from very different points of view.

Mr. Watkins writes, from a severely practical point of view, for and to those who, aspiring to the priesthood, have reached it or the diaconate. This book might very well have been entitled "Don'ts for Deacons," and very obvious "don'ts" most of them seem; when one has done them once. But it is well that some should be saved from buying wisdom so dearly; and Mr. Watkins's friendly, unpatronizing manner is the best guarantee that his counsels will not share the common fate of good advice. That vicars are human is the burden of his song, and it is a truth worth telling; but at times the telling of it (as on p. 41) brings the reader nearer to laughter than to tears.

The little volume edited by Mr. Pinchard consists of five papers reprinted from the *Church Union Gazette*. It was well that they should have been published there; it is better that they should be collected here, in this cheap and handy form (though it is to be hoped that they will also be made available in some binding more permanent than paper); it would be better still if the S.P.C.K. could be persuaded to publish them separately in pamphlet form. All are quite excellent in a matter when slight mistakes can work the gravest harm. If it is possible to distinguish between contributions which reach so uniformly high a standard, the best is perhaps that in which an anonymous religious deals with *The Contemplative Life*. The passage in which it accounts for the place which the Divine Office has always held in that life should go straight into the commonplace-book—but not to stay there.

Fr. Sedding's book is also a reprint—of the Lent Lectures given to the St. Paul's Lecture Society in 1933—to which he has added a series of extracts in illustration of his theme: the continuity of the life of prayer in the Church of England since the Reformation. Even those who share the ignorance which the author professes of the field of knowledge he was led to explore by this theme will acknowledge the attraction of his gallery of period-pieces, while those to whom most of these show-pieces were already familiar will only regret that he did not allow himself time to make a larger and more representative collection. The lectures bear too much the marks of their occasional purpose; the same space would have been better devoted to making more widely accessible some of the treasures of the "Anglo-Catholic Library." Three and sixpence is too much to charge for so tantalizingly short a book; the frontispiece must have cost us several pages of matter ill to be spared.

Fr. Pulley's collection of Fr. Benson's Eucharistic prayers should be

welcome to all who value the paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer, *The Divine Rule of Prayer*, one section of which is here reprinted. Fr. Benson at his best can bear comparison with Andrewes, though he is curiously uneven, passages crabbed or banal in phrasing jostling others of lyrical beauty and limpidity. But his thought is always noble, even when its expression is most difficult; and none will feel that the piety of his sons is partial.

PATRICK THOMPSON.

A HISTORY OF JEWISH LITERATURE, VOL. II. By Meyer Waxman. Bloch Publishing Co., New York. \$4.00.

In this, the second volume of his comprehensive survey of Jewish Literature, Dr. Waxman covers the later mediæval period, beginning in 1200—the first volume began with the close of the Canon and ended with the end of the twelfth century—and leaving as late as 1750, to await the final volume which will complete this generously planned work by a study of the renaissance in Jewish letters which followed the comparative torpor of the seventeenth century and by an account of the modern developments in this vast and varied field.

Dr. Waxman's aim is to bring to the notice of the intelligent public and more particularly to that of Jewish readers, something of the richness and importance of Jewish Literature in the Christian era. All branches of letters are dealt with and the plan of the book facilitates an understanding of the various phases of Jewish literary history by its straightforward manner of presentation. Originality can scarcely be expected in a work of this nature, but a certain superficiality of treatment is apparent in places, notably in the section on the Kabbala, where the author's familiarity with his material seems to have been insufficient to enable him to simplify and as it were translate its excessive obscurities into a lucidity capable of appealing to a public such as he has in mind. This chapter is therefore inclined to fall between two stools and to appear somewhat obscure and uninteresting to the uninitiated reader while striking a slightly naive note for one whose acquaintance with the subject is more intimate. In passing we are constrained to challenge Dr. Waxman's assertion, on p. 404, that "there is little system in the Midrash Zohar, for teachings of different character are thrown together and secrets of mysticism are inserted in the middle of pure Agadic passages." The whole character of the Zohar would seem to contradict this judgment, since its symbolic and interpretative framework is notably consistent and maintains its self-imposed plane of argument throughout without deviation. It assumes its conceptions to be inevitable, valid and universally applicable, and its order is as irrefutably sound within itself as any such structure ever can be—that is, at least as sound as "Alice in Wonderland." That there may also be a more *actually* valid wisdom in the Zohar is of no relevance to the present issue. Dr. Waxman's judgment quoted above may be due to the fact that he appears to view the Zohar proper—that is, the Commentary on the Pentateuch—with less interest than the various interpretations, such as the "Faithful Shepherd," etc., which, while often of great beauty, are less representative. As his book is intended to stimulate interest in the literature discussed, it seems strange that Dr. Waxman made no mention of the English translation of the Zohar which has recently appeared here (by M. Simon, H. Sperling, and Dr. Paul Levertoff, published by the Soncino Press).

The book as a whole should prove useful to readers desiring a general knowledge of Jewish literature. There are a number of proverbs and tales which will amuse. These are well done, though the verse translations are exceedingly weak. The style throughout is undistinguished but serviceable, and the format good, though marred by the presence of a considerable number of typographical errors.

OLGA LEVERTOFF.

THE HAGGADAH. A NEW EDITION WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION, INTRODUCTION AND NOTES. By Cecil Roth. The Soncino Press. 5s.

The cruel persecution of the Jews in Germany today makes us the more anxious to learn all we can about them and the debt we owe to them in so many directions. The object of this note is to call attention to a most useful edition of the *Haggadah* which has recently appeared in Hebrew and English, with valuable introduction and notes.

The *Haggadah* ('telling'), by which name the *Service for the Night of the Passover* is popularly known, is perhaps the oldest of all rituals in common use. The most ancient part of the text is probably 2,500 years old. Its ceremonies, based on the usage of the Temple when the Paschal lamb was consumed, are accompanied by an historical and explanatory recital (*Haggadah*) in answer to the question of the youngest present, according to the command, "And thou shalt tell thy son in that day" (Exod. xiii. 8). Other features of interest which have been incorporated into the service are the *Kiddûsh*, with its influence on the Eucharist (Oesterley, *Jewish Background of Christian Liturgy*, p. 134), and the *Nishmath*, a noble post-Biblical liturgical composition.

The *Haggadah* is not without its attractive puzzles—e.g., the *Afikoman*, the half of the unleavened cake broken off to be eaten at the end of the meal; the opening of the door, perhaps "to indicate the Spirit of freedom" (A. Z. Idelson, *Jewish Liturgy*, p. 184), but "it was nothing uncommon that, when the doors were opened at this part of the service, there were found lurking outside enemies and spies" (A. A. Green, *The Revised Haggada*, p. 68); the cup of Elijah, a special cup of wine placed on a table in readiness for any visitor who may enter the family circle; and the curious nursery rhyme for the children at the end. Perhaps one of the most striking features of this wonderful service is its note of indomitable hope, opening as it does with the prayer, "Now we are here, but next year may we be in the land of Israel! Now we are slaves, but next year may we be free men," and closing with the words, "Next year in Jerusalem."

R. D. MIDDLETON.

MODERN THOUGHT ON TRIAL. By Kenneth Ingram. Philip Allan. 8s. 6d.

This thought-provoking book is divided by its author into two parts—"an outline" and "a criticism" of modern thought. From the nature of the case it is possible to pass a more or less dispassionate judgment on the former part, whereas every reader will be influenced by his personal standpoint in his appraisal of the latter. "Modern thought" is a phrase in constant use, but it is refreshing to find a writer who is prepared seriously to consider what it means. Mr. Ingram is careful to avoid exaggeration; he gives its proper weight to the inevitable disillusionment

of those who expected that the post-war period would usher in the world fit for heroes which was promised by the statesmen of most countries; and he shews how this naturally led to a revolt against authority which extended to the religious and moral as well as to the political and social spheres. It is rather strange that in these circumstances "modern thought regards human nature as being in itself progressively good. It is prepared to trust human nature without deterrents." We do not question that so far Mr. Ingram's diagnosis is correct; but it seems reasonable to wonder whether the second phase of post-war thought which is substituting a series of dictatorships for a world made safe for democracy will not be accompanied by a similar recognition that there is a large place for discipline in a rightly ordered society, and that the *homo naturaliter bonus* of modern thought is as foreign to the real world as he is to traditional theology.

If this be so, we have a vantage-point for criticism of the second part of Mr. Ingram's book. For example, Mr. Ingram's dictum that he would not regard "sex episodes" outside marriage "very seriously" and cannot brand them as deadly sins would seem to be only tenable against the background of a libertarian optimism which is rapidly ceasing to be "modern thought" at all.

But the most serious issue raised by the book is something deeper than this. Mr. Ingram quotes with approval from Canon Wilfred Knox and the Rev. A. R. Vidler, the statement that "the error of scholastic philosophy and Victorian science (lies) in supposing that no system can be true which does not provide a complete explanation of everything in heaven and earth"—an assertion which few moderns would question. But he passes at once, apparently without realizing that he is adding anything of importance, to the totally different theory that "the claim to absolute truth in any field is intellectual suicide." That this is a theory widely held at the present day no one can doubt; but many of us would hold that it expresses not modern thought but modern refusal to think. It is a principle, not of mediæval thinking, but of all rational thinking, that absolute truth is the only kind of truth that there is; and where this is ignored we only find a meaningless vagueness which is an insult to human intelligence. Mr. Ingram appears too ready to pander to this contempt of clear thought. For example, when he faces the problem of the Person of Christ, he writes: "I am content to affirm that I believe Christ to be One Who belongs to an order beyond the human order. I believe Christ to be the manifestation of God. But neither I, nor, I suspect, any other man, can define what deity involves." Mr. Ingram apparently fails to see that a man who cannot define what he means by deity ought not to use the question-begging word "God." If the modern man would be humble enough to learn from the past, he would find that the words "God" and "deity" have acquired a definite connotation; he would discover that the Christian tradition teaches that God is *inter alia* the Creator: so that whereas all else depends on Him both for its form and its existence, He alone exists in His own right; thus, as the Arian controversy made clear, the issue as to the deity of Jesus is the problem whether He is or is not self-existent—whether He is Creator or creature. The modern thinker may answer the problem either way; he may even maintain an attitude of suspense on the ground that the evidence does not suffice for a decision. But he has no right to say that he does not know what the problem is. This illustration shews the fundamental

weakness of Mr. Ingram's critique of the thought which he analyzes with such penetration; but nevertheless there is much in the second part of the book, as well as the first, which is constructive and valuable.

PERCY HARTILL.

PASTORALIA FOR WOMEN: A BOOK FOR WOMEN BY WOMEN. Edited by the Rev. H. S. Marshall. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

This useful volume adds one more item to the debt which Church workers already owe to the S.P.C.K. It is a collection of papers by experts on various aspects of women's work in a parish, and is written with insight and practical ability, while first things are consistently given the first place.

The Bishop of Southwell, as Chairman of the Central Council for Women's Church Work, contributes the Introduction. Already as Bishop of Stepney, Dr. Mosley became known as a staunch friend of the Ministry of Women and the Deaconess Order, and his introduction is an excellent preface to the series.

The subjects dealt with and the authors are as follows: Social Work (Phyllis M. Hatten, Warden of St. Hilda's Settlement). The Woman Worker as a Teacher (Deaconess Ina Brodigan, Head of the College of Greyladies, Blackheath). Young People (Catharine N. Newby, Principal of St. Christopher's College). Evangelization (Gwendolyn Maddren; with a note on Church Army Method). Religious Drama: The Appeal Through the Eye (Beatrice Maybury). Sick Visiting (A. M. Long, S.R.N., Ranyard Mission). The Care of the Sanctuary and its Appointments (Sister Mary Kathleen, C.S.D.).

This book is a kind of refresher course, practical and inspiring, and wonderfully comprehensive in a small compass. No one who reads it attentively has any excuse for persistence in the merely parochial view of her work which is such a common limitation in Church workers. It also corrects the tendency to work in water-tight compartments. Stress, for instance, is laid on the need for co-operation between the Church worker and the social worker. On the one hand, "the Church worker is the Christian liaison officer between social agencies and the people." On the other, "the social agencies are hampered . . . the Church worker alone can make social work fully effective."

All the contributions have a strongly practical flavour; book lists and names and addresses of relevant agencies are given. Miss Newby's fine chapter on "Young People" is specially valuable and stimulating, both as to the principles she lays down and as to their practical application. For example, in the section on Children in Church she writes: "*No child should attend a service without knowing something of its meaning*"; and she follows this up with suggestions as to how this aim may be achieved.

Deaconesses and lay workers alike are advised to buy this book and read it pencil in hand. As the Editor remarks in the Epilogue: "The good craftsman not only is continually learning all he can about his materials and his art, but is experimenting and trying out new methods all his life." Such craftsmen, in the sphere of Pastoralia, this book will help to produce.

MARY STANTON (*Deaconess*).

THE ATONEMENT. A Catholic Restatement. By Ernest A. Dawson. Mowbrays. 5s.

This little book cannot claim to offer any important original contribution to the subject; but it states a point of view lucidly and in an attractive way. Its author rightly insists that the Death of Christ must be understood in the context of His life and teaching; and a study of the Gospel evidence leads to the conclusion that "Christ viewed His death as fulfilling a purpose. He conceived it as the will of God, His Father; as necessary for the winning into existence of the kingdom of God; as a sacrifice, like in kind to the sacrifices of His nation and the Temple, but fulfilling in truth what they only figured, the Sacrifice of the new covenant." Then he turns to the historic theories of the Atonement, prefacing his discussion with some very wise words about the necessity for reserve in accepting the classification into objective and subjective. But when he ventures upon more definitely philosophical ground, Mr. Dawson treads less securely; for example, we find the following: "The Incarnation embodied the universal in the particular, God in man." This sets us wondering in what sense, if any, the relationship between God and man may be rightly thus described; but our bewilderment increases when we read in the next sentence, "The life of Christ having been sacrificed, the particular having returned to the universal," etc. One cannot but feel that if Mr. Dawson were challenged to define his terms he could offer no definitions which would not make nonsense of this passage. The later part of the book is largely concerned with the relationship between Calvary and the Eucharist; this is expounded with reference and clearness along the lines of traditional Catholic theology. Not the least attractive feature of the book is a number of terse sayings such as "A Christian does not practise religion in order that he may be moral; he is moral in order that he may be religious." "It is more important for the savant to test his faith in God by the faith of a little child than the reverse process."

PERCY HARTILL.

A HISTORY OF RELIGION. By H. H. Gowen. S.P.C.K. Pp. 712. 12s. 6d.

The S.P.C.K., which produced *Liturgy and Worship*, is again to be congratulated on bringing out this remarkable book, embracing as it does a bird's-eye view of the history of religion from prehistoric times to the present day, and even venturing on a prophetic view of the future. The standpoint adopted is essentially Christian, but akin to that of the Alexandrian Fathers, who saw Divine Revelation at work in Greek Philosophy as well as in the Old Testament Scriptures. For to Dr. Gowen religion is one in spite of its many varieties, and all its forms find their fulfilment in the religion of the Incarnate Lord.

The author is an expert on Oriental religions, but possesses a vast knowledge of all the other branches of his subject. In the latter he is bound to depend on the authority of others, and this seems noticeably the case in his treatment of the Œcumenical Councils, where in spite of his appreciation of the vital issue at stake at Nicæa he tends to dismiss the work of Ephesus and Chalcedon as originating in the unnecessary zeal of heresy-hunters. The authority he quotes is Dr. Du Bose, whose inadequate view of the Incarnation seems reflected in the author's state-

ment that "Christ is the meeting-point of a revelation of God—and so Son of God—with that of a revelation of Man—and so Son of Man—and therefore 'divinest when He most is Man.'"

To the same cause perhaps may be attributed the fact that, like many other Anglican writers, he fails to bring out the importance of the See of Rome in guiding the course of the Christian Church in the early centuries—a fact emphasized even to excess by German Protestant historians such as Harnack. The only mention, for instance, of Damasus (converted by a rare printer's lapse into "Pope Damasuas," p. 502) is that Jerome found favour with him.

A further criticism which suggests itself is that the historian is sometimes obscured by the theologian and the rhetorician. When so much has to be said in the compass of one volume one regrets that valuable space is sometimes occupied by poetical quotation or episcopal periphrasis. At the same time one would be sorry to lose the most illuminating exegesis that is given of the Apocalyptic utterances of our Lord and of the Apocalypse itself.

The above, however, are very minor criticisms of a work of so much merit. It never fails to hold the reader's interest. It is a veritable mine of information on every kind of religious culture from that of primitive man or of the most backward races of today to the history of the religions of Mohammed and Buddha, to say nothing of the history of Judaism and Christianity. The last, in particular, is presented with a boldness of outline and breadth of view which seeks to do justice to every movement both Catholic and Protestant. The same sympathetic insight is shewn in dealing with non-Christian religions from the lowest to the highest; and however complicated the subject matter, and however unfamiliar the proper names, the wood is never obscured by the presentation of the trees. Finally the work has the greatest value as a piece of Christian apologetic against those who regard all religions as equally worthless, or all as equally true.

H. EDWARD SYMONDS.

OUR PRAYER BOOK PSALTER. By Ernest Clapton. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

It is to Miles Coverdale (1488-1568) that we owe the Prayer Book Psalter which we still use. He became Bishop of Exeter in the reign of Edward VI.; but his great work of translating the Bible into English was done in that of Henry VIII. In the present volume Mr. Clapton prints Coverdale's version of the Psalms published in 1535, with the corresponding sections of the Psalter from the Great Bible, also due to Coverdale (first edit., 1539), on the opposite pages, the latter being the Prayer Book Psalter. To these he adds a very large number of useful marginal notes giving the renderings of the Vulgate and of Coverdale's other sources, and those of our Authorized and Revised Versions, where the occasion calls for it.

The sources used by Coverdale for the Psalter are: The Latin Vulgate (this contains the Gallican Psalter to which the people were accustomed); a translation by Jerome taken direct from the Hebrew; translations by Sanctes Pagninus (1527), by Luther (1524), by the compilers of the Zurich Bible (1529); and by Sebastian Münster (1534) from the Hebrew. This last had a great influence on Coverdale in preparing the Great Bible of 1539.

It is noteworthy that in the Prayer Book version there are no less than sixty-six interpolations from the Vulgate of phrases which are not in the Hebrew. These Coverdale meant to be marked by asterisks; but the asterisks have not remained.

Coverdale was, it seems, a poor Hebrew scholar; but he depended on predecessors who were fair Hebraists. Unfortunately he sometimes repeated their mistakes, and did not always copy their good emendations.

His great merit was in the delicacy and beautifully rhythmical phraseology of his English. For this he deserves to be always remembered.

It would be tempting to give instances of passages where our Prayer Book Psalter differs from the best text of the Hebrew; but Mr. Clapton by his marginal notes gives the reader every opportunity of doing this for himself. It is worth noting that it is to Coverdale that we owe the beautiful phrase "The Lord is my Shepherd," as in the LXX and Hebrew (Psalm xxiii. 1), where all earlier English translators had followed the Vulgate "Dominus regit me." On the other hand, Coverdale retains (from the Vulgate) those verses of Psalm xiv. (5-7 P.B.) which are absent from the best Hebrew text and are rightly excluded by the Authorized and Revised Versions.

The question arises whether the Prayer Book Psalter should be amended. It has many mistakes, but it is couched in beautiful English. Certainly it is true that in a version meant for use in Church worship exact and literal translation is of less importance than rhythmical paraphrase. But is it right that our people should be expected to sing or say passages which are at the best obscure or at the worst misleading? The Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury (Davidson) and presided over by Bishop H. E. Ryle drew up an extremely conservative (perhaps a too conservative) Report, suggesting changes which it thought absolutely necessary (*The Prayer Book Psalter Revised*, S.P.C.K., 1916), and the Committee of the Church Assembly suggested further corrections (N.A. 89). It is to be hoped that the labours of these Committees will be kept in mind. But it may be feared that the spirit of "that blessed word Mesopotamia" is not yet dead.

Mr. Clapton is to be thanked for a most useful book.

A. J. MACLEAN.

RELIGION AND THEISM. By Clement C. J. Webb, F.B.A. Allen and Unwin. 4s. 6d.

This contains the Forwood Lectures delivered at Liverpool University, 1933, together with a chapter on the psychological accounts of the origin of Belief in God. Its value is by no means to be estimated by the number of its pages. In this small volume is packed much incisive criticism of antitheistic theories prominent at the present time, together with a good deal of valuable and fresh constructive presentation of Theism in the face of such challenges. It is right to expect much from the author of *God and Personality* and *Divine Personality and Human Life*, and readers will find in this volume a clear appreciation of the issues raised by some destructive tendencies of contemporary thought. Mr. Webb does not underestimate these tendencies, and equally he does not attach to them an importance to which they can make no rightful claim.

The author has carefully restricted himself to the topic assigned.

He provides a careful analysis and criticism of the several presentations of "religion sans Dieu"—naturalistic, as in Professor Julian Huxley's *Religion without Revelation*; humanistic, as in Mr. Walter Lippmann's *Preface to Morals*. He also deals with a work which is more distinctly weighty than either of these. He recognizes in the *Ethics* of Professor Nicolai Hartmann, recently translated into English by Dr. Stanton Coit, an acute and considerable contribution to the literature of moral philosophy. There are many differences of estimate of the significance of humanity and of man's moral consciousness within the pages of these three representative writers, and their agreement together hardly goes further than a common rejection of Theism, while retaining an indefinite place and function for "religion" divested of the acknowledgment of God. Mr. Webb's great contention is that these writers have failed to do justice to the Theism which they reject, and also that their own recognitions of religion involve a theistic background if full justice is to be done to their implications. That Theism is the true interpretation of religious experience and that belief in God is no treason against "the majesty of human nature" are leading contentions of this volume, and its aim is to shew that the most obvious interpretation of the religious consciousness, considered as a normal feature of human experience, is the consciousness of the presence of a "Beyond" with whom personal relations are possible.

Those will make best use of this valuable little book who, while noting its vindication of Theism in the face of the particular attacks which it is designed to meet, will from it get their right bearings in the wider study of the conception of God. It will help them toward the right answers because it will put before them the right questions. For those whose studies will finally lead them on to philosophical theology and Christian Theism there exists no better general and preliminary introduction. It can do this simply because it makes the reader aware that its own chosen limits, while requisite for the purpose in hand, are not actual limits imposed upon the knowledge of God. The author himself tempts the writer of this review to quote the concluding words of this admirable little volume, revealing as they do the quality of Mr. Webb's writing and the distinction of his thought: "To contend that a real God is required for the interpretation of our religious experience is not to suggest that religion and theology have not before them an ocean for the exploration of which, as the hymn says, 'eternity's too short'; it is only to point out that the ocean in question is not a mere mirage."

F. W. BUTLER.